FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-070
Wednesday
11 April 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-070 CONTENTS *11 April 1990*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Geneva Chemical Weapons Ban Talks Resume *[TASS]* 1
Bogachev Criticizes U.S. Policy on START *[TASS]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gremitskikh 10 Apr Briefing on World Issues 2
  Relations With ROK *[TASS]* 2
  Mubarak Statement *[TASS]* 2
  'Alarming' Press Reports on Summit *[Moscow Radio]* 2
Belgian Proposal Upsets NATO Partners *[PRAVDA 9 Apr]* 2
Roundtable Discusses Lenin, Socialism's Future *[PRAVDA 7 Apr]* 3
Petrovskiy Views Cooperation in World Scene *[TASS]* 3

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Bush Decides Not To Replace U.S. Ambassador *[TASS]* 4
Bush Cited on Forthcoming Washington Summit *[TASS]* 4
Washington Summit, Dialogue Prospects Viewed *[PRAVDA 11 Apr]* 4
Pogodin Views Upcoming Gorbachev-Bush Summit *[Moscow International]* 5
Senator Mitchell Arrives in Moscow for Talks *[TASS]* 5
PRAVDA Views U.S. Military Spending Debate *[6 Apr]* 6
U.S. Announces End to Panama State of Emergency *[TASS]* 7
TASS Reports Record U.S. 'Espionage Budget' 8
Pepsi Cola Chief Cited on Barter Trade Accord *[Moscow Radio]* 8

China

Wang Renzhi Discusses Soviet Ties, Reforms *[NEW TIMES No 14]* 8
China's NPC Proceedings End 4 Apr *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 6 Apr]* 9

Northeast Asia

Foreign Ministry on Japanese Official's Remarks *[Moscow International]* 10
Japan's Ojawa Views Relations With Soviet Union *[PRAVDA 9 Apr]* 11
Doi's Remarks on Six-Nation Meeting Welcomed *[Moscow International]* 12
Ivashko Talks With Japanese Envoy *[Kiev Radio]* 13
Asia-Pacific Talks Called 'Worthy of Note' *[PRAVDA 6 Apr]* 13
USSR Efforts in Asia's Demilitarization Noted *[TASS]* 13

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Prospect of Thailand-PRC-SRV Talks Viewed *[Alekseyev on Moscow International]* 14
Nikolayev Comments on Hun Sen Message to Sihanouk *[Moscow International]* 15
Afghan 'Opposition' Releases Soviet Soldier *[TASS]* 15
Bibit's Escape in Philippines Viewed *[Aleksandrov on Moscow International]* 15
CPV Delegation Studies CPSU Education *[PRAVDA 9 Apr]* 16

Near East & South Asia

- Reportage on Lukyanov's 6-8 Apr Visit to India 16
  - Lukyanov, Gujral Hold Talks *[TASS]* 16
  - Delhi Meetings, Activities Reported *[PRAVDA 6 Apr]* 17
  - Lukyanov Tours India *[TASS* 18
  - Arrives in Bombay 6 Apr *[TASS]* 18
  - Visit to Bombay Reported *[Moscow TV]* 18
  - Lukyanov Meets Maharashtra Leaders *[IZVESTIYA 9 Apr]* 18
  - Terms Visit 'Useful' *[PRAVDA 7 Apr]* 19
  - Final Day in India Reviewed *[TASS]* 20
  - Lukyanov Summarizes Results *[TASS]* 20
  - Discusses Aims, Results *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 8 Apr]* 21
  - Lukyanov Interviewed on Visit *[IZVESTIYA 8 Apr]* 22
- Commentary on Saddam Husayn's 'Hostile' Remarks *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 23

East Europe

- Jaruzelski Outlines Expectations of USSR Visit *[TASS]* 23
  - Arrives in Lvov 11 Apr *[TASS]* 23
- Polish Daily Questions USSR Military Presence *[Warsaw POLITYKA 31 Mar]* 24
- Sejm Privatization, Police Debates Reported *[IZVESTIYA 10 Apr]* 28
- Romania's Salvation Front Appeals to Nation *[TASS]* 29
- Romania's Iliescu Fields Border Issue Question *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Apr]* 29
- Romanian Opposition Launches Election Campaign *[IZVESTIYA 4 Apr]* 30
- Romania's Petre Comments on Ceaucescu Legacy *[MOSCOW NEWS No. 14]* 30
- Article Deplores Revival of Romanian Fascists *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 7 Apr]* 32
- Romanian Land Legislation Controversy Viewed *[PRAVDA 5 Apr]* 33
- Yakovlev Receives Romanian, Polish Envoys *[Moscow Radio]* 34
- First Soviet Troops Leave East Bohemia Region *[Prague Radio]* 34
- 20 Soviet Helicopters Leave Prague for Home *[Prague CTK]* 34
- Views on Soviet Troops in Hungary Pondered *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 4 Apr]* 35
- USSR-Bulgaria Diplomatic 'Consultations' Held *[Sofia NARODNA ARMIYA 4 Apr]* 36
- E. Europe, Soviet Unemployment Prospects Viewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 4 Apr]* 36

West Europe

- British Foreign Secretary Hurd Continues Visit 37
  - Details of Talks Reported *[TASS]* 37
  - Shevardnadze Hails 'Partnership' *[TASS]* 38
  - Hurd Notes 'Serious Improvement' *[TASS]* 38
  - Gorbachev, Hurd Hold Talks *[PRAVDA 11 Apr]* 39
  - Nuclear Disasters Accord Signed *[TASS]* 39
  - Talks End; Hurd Heads for Leningrad *[TASS]* 40
- Commentary on Hopes, Expectations of Hurd Visit *[Moscow International]* 40
- Biryukova Leads Delegation at London Drug Forum *[TASS]* 41
- PRAVDA's Frolov Receives Maxwell, UK Envoy *[PRAVDA 4 Apr]* 42
- Correspondent Files First Dispatch for PRAVDA *[PRAVDA 6 Apr]* 42
- Warsaw Paper Views Estonian Independence Strategy *[Warsaw ZYCIA WARSZAWY 4 Apr]* .. 43
- Scandinavians React to Events in Lithuania *[TRUD 29 Mar]* 44
- Aboimov, Dutch Envoy Discuss German Unification *[IZVESTIYA 31 Mar]* 45
- New Ambassador to Vatican Grants Interview *[IZVESTIYA 31 Mar]* 45
- TASS, Vatican Radio Sign Cooperation Accord *[TASS]* 45
- Voronin Receives Turkish State Minister Taner *[TASS]* 45
- Turkey's Taner Holds News Conference in Moscow *[Ankara Radio]* 46

Latin America & Caribbean

- PRAVDA Views Cuban Economic Relationship *[9 Apr]* 46
- Problems in Cuban Foreign Trade Examined *[Moscow Radio]* 47
- Cuba's Shipping Industry's Problems Noted *[PRAVDA 8 Apr]* 48

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Parliament To Review Union Treaty 10 Apr *[Moscow Radio]* 49
Moscow TV Airs 10 Apr Supreme Soviet Session 49
  Family Issues Viewed 49
  Financial Issues Discussed 50
  Children's Issues Receive Focus 50
  Working Conditions for Women Viewed 50
  Work, Living Standard Debated 51
  Amendments Voted on 52
Further Reporting on 10 Apr Parliament Session 53
  Voronin Speaks on Role of Women *[Moscow TV]* 53
  Resolution on Family Care Adopted *[TASS]* 53
  Law To Protect President Urged *[IZVESTIYA 11 Apr]* 54

Political & Social

Politburo Appeals for Consolidating Ranks *[PRAVDA 11 Apr]* 54
CPSU Letter to Communists on Upcoming Congress *[PRAVDA 11 Apr]* 54
Reportage on 21st Komsomol Congress 56
  Gorbachev Attends Opening *[TASS]* 56
  Gorbachev Addresses Congress *[Moscow Radio]* 56
  Congress Delegates Attend *[Moscow Radio]* 63
  New Program To Be Adopted *[TASS]* 63
Gorbachev Greetings to Media Forum Conveyed *[TASS]* 63
Maslennikov Conducts News Conference 10 Apr *[Moscow Radio]* 64
Moscow Conference Views Future of Cable TV *[IZVESTIYA 31 Mar]* 68
Plans for 5-6 May PRAVDA Festival Described *[PRAVDA 31 Mar]* 69

Economic

Leading Economists on Crisis, Solutions *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 13]* 70
Economic Expert on Ruble Convertibility, Reforms *[Vienna DER STANDARD 7-8 Apr]* 72
Russian Agroindustrial Trade Unionists Meet *[TRUD 15 Mar]* 72
Draft Provisions on Small Business Explained *[IZVESTIYA 2 Apr]* 73
Production, Socioeconomic Data Examined *[TRUD 25 Mar]* 75
Some Improvement in Rail Freight Handling *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 4 Apr]* 76

Agricultural

CPSU CC Panel Discusses Rural Construction *[PRAVDA 7 Apr]* 77

Military

Collegium Discusses Draft Defense Law *[TASS]* 78
Zaykov, Yazov Attend Air Defense Forces Meeting *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Apr]* 79
  Yazov Hails Forces *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Apr]* 79
Soviet Officer on Troop Withdrawal From Hungary *[Budapest MAGYAR HIRLAP 4 Apr]* 80

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Vilnius Radio Carries 10 Apr Council Session 81
  Agenda Announced 81
  Coat of Arms Debated 81
  Vote on Amendments Taken 81
  Status of Deputies Debated 81
  Debates Continue 82

Spokesman Says Moscow Considering 'Measures' *[AFP]* 82
Lithuanian Ministry Protests to Gorbachev *[Vilnius International]* 82
Lithuanian Supreme Council Report on Elections *[Vilnius Radio]* 83
Landsbergis Sends Appeal to Gorbachev *[Vilnius International]* 83
Vilnius on Prunskiene 9 Apr News Conference *[Vilnius International]* 83
Vasilyev Criticizes Prunskiene Statement *[Moscow Radio]* 84
Workers Send Anti-Sajudis Letter to Gorbachev *[TASS]* 84
Reports Indicate Vilnius 'More or Less Quiet' *[Vilnius Radio]* 84
Lithuanian Deputies' Mandate Issue Discussed *[Vilnius Radio]* 85
Ozolas on 'Crude Interference' of USSR Troops *[Vilnius International]* 85
Gorbachev Says Situation Not Irreversible *[TASS]* 85
Presidential Spokesman on Lithuania, Summit *[TASS]* 85
Pro-Moscow Lithuanian Gives News Conference *[TASS]* 86
Party Loyalist Views Lithuanian Situation *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Mar]* 86
Moscow Activities of Pro-CPSU Officials Viewed *[Vilnius International]* 87
Lithuanian Workers Oppose Landsbergis Measures *[Moscow Radio]* 88
Manipulation of Lithuanian Deserters Scored *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Apr]* 88
Lithuanian Intentions on Militia, Army *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 10 Apr]* 90
Journalist's Impressions of Lithuanian Noted *[PRAVDA 10 Apr]* 91
'Yunost' Radio Interviews Landsbergis *[Moscow Radio]* 95
Landsbergis 21 Mar Speech Cites White House *[EKHO LITVY 23 Mar]* 96
Publishing House Takeover Criticized *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 10 Apr]* 97
Loyalist Lithuanian Party Chief Interviewed *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA No 10]* 98
Loyal Lithuanian CP To Hold Congress *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 8 Mar]* 99
Students To Hold Rally in Vilnius 12 Apr *[Vilnius Radio]* 99
Tula Political Club Supports Independence *[Vilnius Radio]* 99
Leningrad Rally Supports Lithuanian Independence *[Vilnius International]* 100
Kirgiz Front Urges Support for Lithuanians *[Vilnius Radio]* 100
Lithuanian Women Received at Defense Ministry *[Vilnius International]* 100
Academic Protests Against Travel Ban *[IZVESTIYA 27 Mar]* 101
British, Finnish Correspondents View Lithuania *[PRAVDA 23 Mar]* 101
Washington News Conference on Lithuania *[TASS]* 102
Lithuanian Parliament Commission Members Listed *[EKHO LITVY 23 Mar]* 102
Lithuanian Law on Government Published *[EKHO LITVY 30 Mar]* 104
Baltic Council Session Set for 14 Apr in Estonia *[Vilnius Radio]* 109
Supreme Soviet Continues Debate on Independence *[PRAVDA 11 Apr]* 109
Estonian Supreme Soviet Discusses State Status *[TASS]* 110
Estonia's Lauristin Interviewed on Independence *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 8 Mar]* 110
Walkout Makes Latvian CP Split 'Inevitable' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Apr]* 112
Vyalyas, Sillari Caution Estonians *[PRAVDA 9 Apr]* 115
Latvian People's Front Election Platform *[ATMODA 12 Feb]* 115
Independent Latvian CP Draft Program Published *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 23 Feb]* 117

RSFSR

Moscow Voters Deputies' Criticize Lithuania Appeal *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 7 Apr]* 121
'Passions' Mar Preparations for Russian Congress *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Apr]* 123
RSFSR Official Views Economic Independence *[Moscow Radio]* 124
Moscow Rayon Named for Voroshilov Renamed *[IZVESTIYA 1 Apr]* 124
Bashkir Supreme Soviet Elects Chairman *[Moscow TV]* 124
Gusev Elected to Sverdlovsk Post *[Moscow TV]* 125
Ulyanovsk Obkom First Secretary Elected *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Apr]* 125
Unscheduled Ivanov Leningrad TV Speech Reported *[IZVESTIYA 8 Apr]* 125
Russian Christian Democratic Movement Launched *[TASS]* 126
First Independent Radio Station To Be Set Up *[Moscow Radio]* 126
IZVESTIYA Apologizes for Alleged Story *[IZVESTIYA 12 Mar]* 126

Western Republics

Rukh Leader Opposed to Secession of Ukraine *[Prague MLADA FRONTA 5 Apr]* 126
Ukrainian Group Denounces Lithuanian Leaders *[TASS]* 127
Ukrainian Democratic Bloc Deputies Meet *[Kiev International]* 127
First Secretary Ivashko Visits Donetsk Oblast 128
    Visits Industrial Workers *[Kiev Radio]* 128
    Speaks at Election Conference *[Moscow Radio]* 128
Ukraine Appeals for Post-Chernobyl Foreign Aid *[TASS]* 128
Measures Adopted To Assist Chernobyl Victims *[TASS]* 128
Decree Issued on Vacations for Chernobyl Children *[TASS]* 129
Kebich Selected as New Belorussian Premier *[TASS]* 129
Belorussian Party Plenum Elects New Leaders *[ZVYAZDA 28 Mar]* 129
Belorussian Presidium Appeals for Order *[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 24 Feb]* 130
Belorussian Runoff Elections Held *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 23 Mar]* 130
Moldavian Chairman Discusses Sovereignty *[MOSCOW NEWS No 14]* 131
Moldavian Groups Hold Political Roundtable *[Moscow Radio]* 132

Caucasus

Army General Views Caucasus Draft Problems *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Apr]* 132
Armenian 'Hooligans' Said To 'Harm' President *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 11 Apr]* 132
Armenian Party Head on Rebuilding Republic *[TASS]* 132
Nakhichevan, Armenian Leaders Discuss Situation *[Baku Radio]* 133
Azerbaijan's Orudzhev Meets Rayon Workers *[Baku Radio]* 133
Azerbaijan Council of Ministers Meeting Reported *[Baku Radio]* 133
Azerbaijan's Mutalibov Visits Lachinskiy Rayon *[Baku Radio]* 134
Azerbaijan Party Official on Komsomol Conference *[Baku Radio]* 134
Tbilisi University Autonomy Changes Cited *[MOLODEZH GRUZII No 7]* 134

Geneva Chemical Weapons Ban Talks Resume

LD1004135890 Moscow TASS in English 1311 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] Geneva April 10 TASS—The 15th round of the Soviet- U.S. consultations on the prohibition of chemical weapons began here today.

The Soviet delegation is led by Sergey Batsanov, Soviet representative at the disarmament conference in Geneva, and the American—by Stephan Ledogar, U.S. representative at the conference.

The delegations will continue work on a bilateral agreement on Soviet-American mutual commitments until an international convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons enters into force.

These commitments include the reduction of chemical arms stockpiles to equally low levels.

It is planned that this agreement will be signed during the forthcoming Soviet-American summit. During the consultations, the sides will also discuss some other issues.

Bogachev Criticizes U.S. Policy on START

LD1004185690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1345 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 10 Apr (TASS)—Vladimir Bogachev, TASS observer on military issues, writes:

The results of the Washington conversations of USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze with President George Bush and Secretary of State James Baker show that there is no firm conviction either in Moscow or in Washington that a treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive arms (START) of both countries will be signed at the upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit on 30 May-3 June.

It is true that the Soviet minister expressed the hope that before the beginning of the visit of USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev to the United States, the leaders of the foreign policy departments of the two countries, at a further meeting in the middle of May, will succeed in "overcoming the greater part of the difficulties and in finding mutually acceptable versions on the problems in the START treaty which remain unresolved." While the U.S. secretary of state stated that in Washington, it is said that the possibility of having by the time of the summit "a treaty, practically ready for signing" was never considered to be "too real."

What is the reason for the slowing down of the process of preparation of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on the 50 percent reduction of strategic offensive arms?.

Up until now, at the talks in Geneva, the sides have not managed to find a mutually acceptable solution on sea-launched and air- launched cruise missiles. In its time, Washington has called cruise missiles "a wonder weapon" which is called upon to resolve not only the Pentagon's military, but also political and economic tasks.

In pushing funding for these systems through the U.S. Congress, representatives of the U.S. Air Force in particular have stressed that for every dollar invested in the creation of U.S. cruise missiles, the Soviet Union will have to pay out 4-5 dollars for the creation of a reliable defense against these offensive systems. This feature of cruise missiles, in the view of the Pentagon strategists, allows the United States to try and achieve two aims at once: To secure military supremacy over the USSR, and to force the Soviet Union to spend enormous funds on unproductive military programs.

The current U.S. military strategy, worked out under the leadership of the former U.S. Secretaries of Defense Caspar Weinberger and Frank Carlucci, provides for a system of measures which are designed "to undermine the Kremlin's military and economic potential and deprive it of the possibility of reorienting resources towards civilian ends." The creation of U.S. cruise missiles, like implementation of Reagan's "Star Wars" program, pursues the aim of dragging the USSR into an arms race on terms most favorable for the United States, and thereby derailing plans for lifting the Soviet economy.

There are grounds for believing that Bush, Baker, and other sensible politicians in the United States have an interest in the success of Soviet perestroyka. After all, a sharp change in the political situation in the Soviet Union could also aggravate Soviet- American relations. And this would be fraught with dangerous consequences for military and political stability in the world. At the same time, the U.S. Administration, evidently, is not averse to taking advantage of the Soviet Union's internal difficulties to secure the United State's military supremacy. It seems that the American side's position on cruise missile at the talks on strategic offensive weapons is determined to a considerable extent by precisely such considerations.

Gremitskikh 10 Apr Briefing on World Issues

Relations With ROK

LD1004134690 Moscow TASS in English 1333 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 10 TASS—The recent visit by South Korean Politician Kim Yong-sam to Moscow revealed the conviction of the Soviet Union and South Korea that the development of relations is beneficial for both countries and promotes stronger peace and security on the Korean Peninsula, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told a briefing here today.

Yuriy Gremitskikh said that trade, scientific and cultural ties between the Soviet Union and South Korea "have seen a marked rise in the past couple of years."

Speaking about the possibility of estabilishing diplomatic relations, he said this issue "has not been discussed at official level."

"The Soviet Union believes that this issue can be practically considered only in the context of the general development of the situation on the Korean peninsula."

Mubarak Statement

LD1004144790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1350 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 10 Apr (TASS)—The Soviet Union has received with satisfaction the recent statement by Egyptian President Muhammad Husni Mubarak on his country's intention to direct its efforts toward ridding the Middle East of weapons of mass destruction, said Yuriy Gremitskikh, first deputy head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, at a briefing here today.

In this context, he recalled that specifically during Eduard Shevardnadze's visit to the Middle East in February last year, the Soviet side voiced ideas on the creation in this region of a zone free of nuclear and chemical weapons, on the limitation of missile weaponry there, and on the reduction in the level of military confrontation. Yuriy Gremitskikh stressed that in the future, as well, the Soviet Union would be ready for cooperation with all who truly strive for peace and stability in the Middle East.

'Alarming' Press Reports on Summit

LD1004151190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] The world press is animatedly discussing the results of Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze's visit to Washington and, above all, the accord reached there on the dates and agenda of the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. The mass media in the United States is particularly awash with commentary. There are many sound and thoughtful publications, but at the same time one can also trace aspects that are alarming, and it was to these that attention was drawn at today's briefing for journalists by Gremitskikh, first deputy chief of the Information Directorate of our Foreign Ministry. He noted that now, when the Soviet and U.S. sides are preparing an accord of importance to all countries and peoples, the press should manifest a feeling of responsibility and objectivity, and a commitment to the constructive development of Soviet-U.S. dialogue.

Belgian Proposal Upsets NATO Partners

PM1004151590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Apr 90 Second Edition pp 1,4

[Vladimir Peresada dispatch: "Disturber of the Peace"]

[Text] Belgium has again "disturbed the peace" within NATO. Following the recent commotion over the possible withdrawal of Belgian troops from the FRG, there is, evidently, something new afoot. Belgian National Defense Minister Guy Coeme has sent to NATO Secretary General M. Woerner a letter containing a proposal to effect a considerable reduction in short-range nuclear weapons in Europe and in the longer term to repudiate altogether certain types of nuclear armament.

This initiative has been made precisely at a time when preparations are under way for a session of NATO's Nuclear Planning Group, scheduled for 9-10 May in Canada. "It would be unacceptable," the letter says, "if in the present circumstances the session continued to discuss the modernization of this weapon. In the light of the shifts in East Europe and the ongoing disarmament process it is essential to reexamine the doctrine on the place of nuclear weapons in alliance strategy." The minister recalled in this connection that the Belgian Government is in favor of talks and the conclusion of an agreement on tactical nuclear weapons in Europe.

Let me explain that the letter is referring to nuclear artillery and the land-based Lance missiles sited chiefly in the FRG. They are also to be found in Belgium. As has become known, the NATO modernization plan envisages increasing the range of these missiles by a factor of four, taking it up almost to that of the shorter-range missiles subject to elimination under the Soviet-U.S. treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. Insofar as this scheme had already elicited objections from many West European countries, a final decision on modernization was deferred until 1992. However, the possibility of tactical weapons talks with the Warsaw Pact countries was made dependent on the signing and the start of implementation of an agreement on conventional armaments. But now the Belgian minister is effectively proposing to close the "modernization theme" and begin moving toward such talks.

It must be said that today other NATO countries too are thinking about "softening" the approaches to this issue. On the eve of the Canada meeting—writes LES NOUVELLES ATLANTIQUES, which has close ties to alliance headquarters—various options relating to the fate of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe are being studied.

The U.S. Administration is looking at the possibility of abandoning the modernization plans, while the other day British Prime Minister Thatcher, a particularly ardent supporter of this weapon, even spoke in favor of reducing their numbers.

However, the Coeme proposal envisages a much greater step forward. And although the initiative does not affect the two other elements of the "nuclear triad"—air-launched and sea-launched tacical missiles—it will probably arouse the displeasure of the senior alliance partners. It is no accident that NATO's press service has already designated this proposal premature. But is this the correct conclusion? Because if you look at things from the positions of common sense and the interests of security in Europe and the world, then it sounds most timely.

Roundtable Discusses Lenin, Socialism's Future

PM1004103390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Apr 90 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Ever Relevant"]

[Text] Twentieth-century world history is unimaginable without V.I. Lenin, his ideas and deeds. The major reformer and revolutionary, scientist, and founder of the first socialist state is with us even today. The true grandeur of Lenin's ideas is particularly relevant now—during the implementation of the cardinal transformations of Soviet society and the vivifying processes of socialist renewal. This was discussed at an international roundtable entitled "V.I. Lenin's Ideas and the Future of Socialism" which was held in Moscow 5 April.

Petrovskiy Views Cooperation in World Scene

LD1104082990 Moscow TASS in English 2109 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 10 TASS—Cooperation of a new character—"cooperation-partnership" between all states—in the mammoth joint venture named "future of mankind" is being born in the system of new political thinking.

This idea was expressed by Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy who addressed the 11th world media conference in Moscow today.

It is being attended by journalists, former heads of state and government, prominent politicians, public figures and religious leaders from over 40 countries.

The Soviet Union is pursuing its foreign policy in the period of perestroyka precisely along these lines. It strives to achieve the best outside conditions for its radical renewal and to show the democratic potential of the socialist choice, Petrovskiy said.

"Opening ourselves to the outside world, we painstakingly tally every our step with the interests of our partners," he noted.

Stressing that the USSR attaches much importance to Soviet-American relations, the deputy minister dealt with the forthcoming summit in Washington.

He emphasized that the Soviet Union hopes for detailed and frank talks and for a broader sphere of confidence in Soviet-American relations.

Major decisions are being prepared for the summit in order to sign, even this year, a treaty on a 50 per cent reduction in strategic offensive weapons, to complete the first stage of the Vienna talks on conventional weapons in Europe and to achieve new progress at the talks on the prohibition of chemical weapons, he said.

There are grounds to hope for a considerable progress in other "baskets" of the Soviet-American dialogue, including bilateral relations.

Petrovskiy stressed Europe's influence on global cooperation. The German issue has come to the fore of European politics. The Soviet stand on this question is well known, he noted.

"We believe that the implementation of the inalienable right of the German people to unity should preclude, fully and for all times, the danger of war from the German territory."

According to the deputy minister, the settlement of this key issue should also include the rights of the four powers, inviolability of borders, a link with the European process, unacceptability of Germany's membership in NATO and the need for a peaceful treaty by the results of the Second World War.

The situation in Europe needs resolute acceleration of the CSCE process, Petrovskiy said. In this context the new European summit with the participation of the United States and Canada this autumn assumes additional importance.

In Asia, Petrovskiy continued, the Soviet Union is ready to build relations on the principles of cooperation and partnership. It intends to promote consistently initiatives put forward in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk to create reliable structures for Asian security.

Petrovskiy expressed confidence that the present forum would be a university of partnership and would help plot routes for advance towards cooperation of a new kind, which would accord with imperatives of our times.

United States & Canada

Bush Decides Not To Replace U.S. Ambassador

LD1104103890 Moscow TASS in English 1033 GMT 11 Apr 90

[Text] Washington April 11 TASS—After consultations with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, President Bush has decided to prolong the term of U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union Jack Matlock. In accordance with practice of the U.S. State Department, the term of office of an ambassador is three years. For Matlock it expires at the end of the current year. There was much speculation in Washington political circles about who would replace him as ambassador.

The State Department prepared a preliminary list of possible candidates. Its content was not disclosed, but, according to the State Department sources, it included the names of leading career diplomats.

The WASHINGTON POST newspaper reports that the U.S. leadership considered the possibility of replacing Matlock with a well-known public figure, who would symbolise U.S. support for changes in the USSR. The newspaper pointed out, however, quoting administration sources, that Bush and Baker found it inappropriate to replace the ambassador right now and said that they were more than pleased with his performance.

Bush Cited on Forthcoming Washington Summit

LD1104074790 Moscow TASS in English 0722 GMT 11 Apr 90

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Fedyashin]

[Text] Washington April 11 TASS—U.S. President George Bush expressed hope on Tuesday that his forthcoming summit with President Mikhail Gorbachev would serve as a "catalyst" for the settlement of differences and different approaches to the solution of arms control problems. Bush answered journalists' questions aboard Air Force One, on his way from Washington to Toronto, where he later met Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney.

Mentioning personal messages exchanged by Bush and Gorbachev recently, the U.S. President said that he was not going to disclose their contents, because they would then cease to be personal, but pointed out that the sides "have much work to do" before reaching arms control agreements, and they are ready for it.

"We have got a time frame now in which there is an awful lot to be done, so I cannot even predict how much will be done by the time the summit rolls around," Bush said. "But it is a good thing the summit date is set. It is important that we continue to talk to Mr. Gorbachev, and obviously this will serve as a bit of a catalyst for getting thing done." He refused, however, to promise that all the details would be resolved by the time the summit begins.

Bush stated openly that he was by no means disappointed at the results of the recent meeting in Washington between U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze. On the contrary, he said that "the visit with Shevardnadze was very good."

"I am not disappointed... you deal with what is on the table, and I am determined to see that there is no misunderstanding about the American position, and that is why I feel that the visit with Shevardnadze was very good," Bush pointed out.

He added that he intended to discuss with the Canadian prime minister a wide range of issues, including problems of Eastern Europe, Central and South America, as well as their bilateral relations.

Washington Summit, Dialogue Prospects Viewed

PM1004173390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Apr 90 First Edition p 5

[Gennadiy Vasilyev "Viewpoint" article: "High Stakes"]

[Text] So the coordinates and the time have been set: Washington, 30 May-3 June. The Soviet and U.S. presidents are to meet then in the U.S. capital.

The constructive Soviet-American dialogue—which started five years ago with the meeting in Geneva, when the world was only just beginning to thaw after the "heavy frost" of the first half of the eighties—will be resumed, as it was three years ago, by the leaders of the two great powers in the city on the banks of the Potomac. The place where, it is pertinent to mention, the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles—the first ever agreement on the actual elimination of part of the nuclear arsenal—was signed.

Official assessments of the upcoming event have already been made by the main dramatis personae—the top leaders of the USSR and the United States. M.S. Gorbachev, in his replies to a PRAVDA correspondent, said that he expects a "detailed, free discussion and a widening of the sphere of trust in Soviet-U.S. relations," laying particular stress on the significance of the accords that are being prepared on questions of arms reduction and disarmament. G. Bush reacted to the upcoming meeting during a news conference at the convention of the U.S. Society of Newspaper Editors. "We are making an effort to conclude important agreements in the arms control sphere, to achieve progress in the human rights sphere, and to settle regional conflicts," he said, adding that he was looking forward to the meeting with M.S. Gorbachev.

The date of the upcoming summit was announced during Soviet Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze's visit to Washington. This visit, the three-day talks between the head of the Soviet diplomatic department and his U.S. counterpart J. Baker, and his two-hour conversation with President G. Bush were an important stage on the path to the summit. The sides worked through the gamut of Soviet-American relations included in the five so-called "baskets": disarmament, bilateral, humanitarian, regional, and transnational. Progress was easier on some questions like, for example, the upcoming trade agreement; on others—the Treaty on Strategic Offensive Armaments—certain difficulties arose. Differences are natural when we are talking about exceedingly "sensitive" national security matters.

So Moscow and Washington have decided to continue the dialogue and fill it with even more solid substance. This, I think, is the chief result of E.A. Shevardnadze's transatlantic trip. They made this decision despite the attendant circumstances that have a tendency to interfere in the course of events. Indeed, as well as the problems we can foresee—such as, for example, different interpretations of various points in the disarmament programs—there will also be problems neither we nor the Americans had planned on. I mean the question of Lithuania. A difficult question for us that requires a calm, delicate untangling of all the knots in accordance with the USSR Constitution. In the old days of confrontation, acute internal problems, whether in the Soviet Union or the United States, traditionally made the opposing side want to give advice on how they should be settled or simply to try to make political capital. On this occasion too many U.S. senators and congressmen proved unable to resist the temptation. Their resolutions "in support of Lithuanian independence" demand that the U.S. Government adopt a "tougher line" toward the Soviet Union. It seems to me that the U.S. Administration has so far not yielded to the pressure. "In U.S.-Soviet relations, the stakes for us are extremely high and too much has been staked already," President Bush said.

Indeed the stakes are of historic significance: prevention of a nuclear catastrophe, building of a new world order based on the strength of the law, collaboration in the settlement of regional conflicts, cooperation in the solution of global problems. One would like to believe that in our complex relations with the United States long-term interests will prevail over short-term considerations.

Pogodin Views Upcoming Gorbachev-Bush Summit

LD0904163290 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 9 Apr 90

[Aleksandr Pogodin commentary]

[Text] With the date of the Gorbachev-Bush summit now set, observers are asking what one can expect from it. According to the Soviet president, the sides are to sum up the work done since the Malta meeting and reach agreements on arms control, disarmament, and other issues. If they manage to do so, Gorbachev said, the meeting will be a success. We have this commentary from Aleksandr Pogodin.

Many observers are being skeptical about the prospect of such agreements being reached. Indeed, last week's meeting between Foreign Minister Shevardnadze and Secretary of State Mr. Baker revealed major differences on reduction of strategic offensive weapons. The high hopes for an agreement in that area have so far failed to materialize. True, it would be better if an agreement were ready for signing now, but there is no cause for despair. Quite recently any hindrance in Soviet-American talks threw them back immediately, leading to mutual allegations. Not today. The obstacles now only prompt the sides to put more effort in dealing with them. According to Shevardnadze, they have retained optimism and are confident that most obstacles will be coped with during his next meeting with Mr. Baker between 16th and 19th May, that is two weeks prior to the Gorbachev visit to the United States.

Above al!, both sides expect to reach a mutually acceptable formula on strategic offensive weapons. After all, they did make headway towards banning and destroying chemical weapons and on protocols to nuclear testing treaties. Also, the sides have never been so close on regional conflicts. They did more than reach mutual understanding here to pool efforts in their negotiated settlement. We can now talk of interaction in this area.

While there is no safe prediction as to the outcome of the next foreign minister's meeting, Gorbachev and Bush will certainly not come to the summit emptyhanded.

Senator Mitchell Arrives in Moscow for Talks

LD1104141290 Moscow TASS in English 1354 GMT 11 Apr 90

[By TASS correspondent Konstantin Voytsekhovich]

[Text] Moscow April 11 TASS—Soviet-American relations have good prospects. Although we do not always agree with each other, the necessary structures have been created in recent years for free and frank discussions, opening up broad opportunities for interaction, Senate Democratic majority leader George Mitchell said today. He heads a delegation of U.S. Senators now visiting the Soviet Union. Today the delegation arrived in Moscow from Leningrad.

"We appreciate the warm and close relations that have been established between our countries in recent years," Mitchell told journalists at the airport. He said he hoped the current trip of U.S. congressman to the USSR would contribute to broader relations between the two countries.

Speaking about his forthcoming meeting in Moscow, Mitchell said he expected to have constructive discussions with Soviet officials on a broad range of questions. He said the delegation met President Bush on the eve of their departure for the Soviet Union to discuss Soviet-American relations. The President asked them to discuss several problems with the Soviet leadership and to report on the results of their talks.

Asked what impact the forthcoming Washington summit meeting would have on relations between the two countries, Mitchell said he hoped an agreement would be concluded to radically reduce strategic offensive weapons. He said substantial progress had been achieved in relations between the USSR and the United States, both nuclear and conventional. Such agreements would benefit the peoples of both countries and would allow much of the military budget to be redirected to social and economic needs.

Mitchell dwelt in detail on perestroyka in the USSR. He said the United States was interested in Soviet efforts to promote glasnost and carry out economic reforms and wished them success.

Speaking about the situation in Lithuania, Mitchell said he was somewhat concerned about the present situation. The senator supported the U.S. policy that does not recognise the Baltic republics' accession to the USSR and expressed the view that both sides could settle the existing contradictions peacefully, through dialogue.

PRAVDA Views U.S. Military Spending Debate

*PM0604131090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
6 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 5*

[Article by PRAVDA political observer Gennadiy Vasilyev: "The 'Dividends of Peace'—How Should They Be Used? U.S. Debate on Military Policy"]

[Text] "What will happen to America if peace breaks out?" Although a lasting and irreversible peace is still quite a long way off, this question, which was once used as a headline in the WALL STREET JOURNAL, is again worrying the U.S. public.

This is how TIME magazine depicts the dilemma facing the country: "For centuries generals and admirals have spent their time drawing up plans for the last war. The American military are no exception: For 45 years they have been preparing for the Soviet version of the Blitzkrieg.... The great war, if it ever broke out, would begin with the invasion of West Germany via the Fulda passage by columns of Warsaw Pact tanks and armored vehicles. This would mark the start of a conflict that could become a nuclear Armageddon. Attempts to contain or rebuff a Soviet invasion of Western Europe determined virtually everything in the American armed forces: personnel requirements, arms designs, budgetary needs, and all the rest. Every day this apocalyptic prospect is becoming increasingly obsolete...."

"Becoming obsolete...." A restrained way of putting it. It would be more correct to say that it is losing all verisimilitude and is no longer perceived by people as realistic. The historical changes the world is experiencing, first and foremost perestroyka in the USSR and the process of democratic changes in Eastern Europe, are making the "Red threat" look like cardboard monsters from Disney's pavilion of horrors. But the collapse of the "enemy image" has far-reaching consequences. The very basis of the West's military-political and ideological positions in the world is called into question. Debates have broken out among public circles in the NATO countries and among scholars, politicians, and military experts on military policy, questions of strategy, and the associated economic problems.

In the United States heated arguments have flared up over the Pentagon budget and its size, content, and orientation. The size of appropriations for the military department's needs for fiscal 1990-1991 proposed by the administration is set at $295 billion (or 306 billion if you add expenditure on nuclear tests, which is concealed in the Energy Department's budget). A huge sum! It would be wrong to say that U.S. military appropriations are continuing to grow while ours are being reduced. The draft Pentagon budget now under discussion in the U.S. Congress is 2.6 percent lower than the previous one at comparable prices and approximately 13 percent lower than in the peak fiscal year of 1984-1985. It is planned to close a number of military bases, and during the nineties it is proposed to reduce somewhat the numerical strength of the armed forces and to cut the number of warships. That is all true, and must be taken into account. But we cannot close our eyes to the fact that in general the budget retains all the main principles of previous years, including the program to create mobile MX missiles based on railroad flatcars, the programs for the construction of B-2 "Stealth" bombers and "Seawolf" submarines, and, finally, the SDI program, for which $4.4 billion is requested.

The budget proposed by U.S. Defense Secretary Richard Cheney at once became the focus of heated political debates on and around Capitol Hill. Many people think that it is in the spirit of the old times and does not take account of the radical changes in the world or America's own needs. Richard Gephardt, leader of the Democrats in the House of Representatives, accused the Bush administration of inconsistency in formulating American foreign policy goals and the President of "going with the flow, lacking foresight, and lacking imagination." Americans have witnessed a rather rare phenomenon—public disagreements between the Pentagon and the CIA. In this dispute intelligence chief W. Webster sides with the "doves"—he states that whatever course events in the East take, a revival of the "Soviet threat" is impossible. Cheney, however, in his customary "hawkish" plumage, argues the opposite—the development of events is not irreversible and America should keep its powder dry.

Today those who advocate continuing the military race find it far harder than before to convince the public that they are right. There is a growing conviction in the United States that the radical changes in the international situation arising from the transformations in the USSR and East European countries offer Americans the "dividends of peace": the opportunity to redirect billions of dollars from miltiary to civilian needs. And America has many such needs: There is the threatening budget deficit, social programs, which have been cut every year recently, and the shortage of funds for scientific research work, in which Japan is outstripping the United States in terms of scale. Former U.S. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, who enjoys great prestige, believes that by the end of the decade the Pentagon budget could be halved. "We could," McNamara says, "considerably strengthen our status as a world power, strengthen our military security, and divert resources into worthier sectors of our economy."

I suppose that those Americans who demand the reduction of U.S. military expenditure are encouraged by the fact that a real reduction in arms and armed forces is taking place in the world today—both within the framework of Soviet-American agreements, and unilaterally by the Soviet Union. This last point is of particular significance, because it convinces even the most sluggish people that the Soviet Union does not intend to attack anyone. It is well known that large-scale cuts in armed forces and armaments have been carried out recently by the USSR and the other Warsaw Pact countries. This offers an opportunity considerably to curtail military appropriations. The First Congress of USSR People's Deputies decided that our military expenditure will be reduced by 14 percent in 1990-1991. We intend, if the situation permits, drastically to reduce—by one-third to one-half—the proportion of our defense spending by 1995. All this is happening in the context of a radical revision of our views on ensuring national and universal security. The transition from superarming to the principle of reasonable sufficiency and a purely defensive doctrine means not only a reduction in the strength of armed forces and armaments, but also a change in their composition, technical equipment, and deployment. Unfortunately the United States is patently lagging behind in the general reinterpretation of military principles and doctrines formulated in different conditions.

Information recently leaked into the press on a new secret guidance on military planning for 1992-1997, issued by the Pentagon. Judging from reports published in THE NEW YORK TIMES, only one thing is new in this directive document—"Defense Department staffers have concluded that a Soviet march on the Persian Gulf oil regions is unlikely." For the rest, there are the old directives on rebuffing a "full-scale Soviet offensive in Europe" and on the first use of nuclear weapons, and the doctrines of "flexible response" and "nuclear deterrence." As if nothing had changed in the world.

In these conditions great significance is attached to meetings among the leaders of the Warsaw Pact and NATO armed forces, the exchange of opinions, and the comparison of military doctrines. Like the seminar held in Vienna not long ago, with the participation of representatives of the top military leadership of European states, as well as the United States and Canada. In this connection I would like to mention an idea put forward by the head of the Soviet delegation, General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff: Why should the United States and the USSR and NATO and the Warsaw Pact now, in the new conditions, not adopt a joint pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, as the USSR and the PRC have already done?

I believe that the conceptual lag in relation to the pace of change in the world explains many practical problems concerning the size of the U.S. military budget and the directives for the American armed forces. The world has entered a crucial stage in its development, in which the structure of the military-political equilibrium is undergoing fundamental changes and questions of national and universal security are appearing in a new light. You could say that life itself has reeducated us. The tasks of perestroyka, of taking the country out of a profound socioeconomic crisis, have made us take an unprejudiced look at many questions, including questions of ensuring national security. They have helped us to realize that the country's level of protection is not directly proportionate to the number of rubles spent on defense or the numbers of missiles and tanks. It is more difficult for the Americans to grasp the realities of the new era. A successfully functioning economy, the country's vast scientific and technical potential—all this does not promote revolutionary "breakthroughs" in awareness, but makes the traditional strong-arm reflexes more persistent.

All the same, the United States has its difficulties, problems, concerns. They are making it reexamine age-old stereotypes, as the debate that has developed in the United States on the country's military policy testifies.

...But Soviet tanks are indeed on the move. Not to the West, but to the East. Loaded onto railroad flatcars, they are returning home, where a considerable proportion of them will be melted down. And this will apparently make life more difficult for some people across the ocean, less comfortable than it was in the familiar conditions of political tension and military confrontation.

U.S. Announces End to Panama State of Emergency

LD0604181490 Moscow TASS in English 1428 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Washington April 6 TASS—President George Bush announced on Thursday an end to the state of emergency with relation to Panama.

The U.S. Administration's move was motivated by the need to normalise trade and economic links with that country, invaded by the United States last December.

The restoration of democratically elected government put an end to the unusual and extreme threat to U.S. national security, foreign policy and economy presented by the policy and actions of Manuel Antonio Noriega, an executive order issued by President Bush pointed out.

Noriega is presently in custody in Miami on charges of complicity in drug trafficking.

The state of emergency vis-a-vis Panama was imposed by the Reagan Administration on April 8, 1988 as part of measures to topple Noriega. The measures included an end to U.S. payments for the use of the Panama Canal, the freezing of nearly 400 million Panamanian dollars in U.S. banks and the curtailment of Panamanian-American trade.

The Bush administration added new sanctions against Panama, including a ban on ships flying the Panamanian flag from calling at U.S. ports.

Panamanian deposits in U.S. banks were unfrozen and other trade and economic sanctions lifted after Guillermo Endara was sworn in as a result of the invasion.

The U.S. Senate is now considering President Bush's proposal for a 500-million dollars-worth of economic aid to Panama. The House of Representatives has already agreed to the aid package after cutting the sum to 420 million dollars.

TASS Reports Record U.S. 'Espionage Budget'

LD0904111190 Moscow TASS in English 1054 GMT 9 Apr 90

[Text] San Francisco April 9 TASS—The U.S. Administration has requested 30 billion dollars for the needs of the secret services in the 1991 fiscal year.

The LOS ANGELES TIMES newspaper reports that more that a half of this record amount is expected to be spent on spying in East European countries, despite moves towards democracy in that region.

The newspaper notes that the "espionage budget", the details of which are classified, is now under discussion in the U.S. congress. Acute differences arose during a debate between advocates and opponents of the increase in spending for intelligence activities in Eastern Europe.

A number of U.S. law-makers criticised the U.S. Administration's policy, emphasising that it ignores the political realities of the rapidly changing world, the LOS ANGELES TIMES writes.

The budget plan for the activities of secret services, worked out by the White House, is in fact a cold war budget, one of the participants in the congressional debate told the newspaper.

Many law-makers believe that U.S. Secret Services should concentrate more efforts and funds in areas that are outside the "traditional rivalry between East and West." They call in particular for devoting more attention to fighting international terrorism and drugs traficking.

According to the latest data, 25 billion dollars were assigned in the 1989 fiscal year for the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, and the Defence Intelligence Agency and other similar organisations.

Pepsi Cola Chief Cited on Barter Trade Accord

LD1004090790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] After almost 20 years we have again struck a deal with Pepsi Cola, one of the world's major companies. A trade agreement amounting to $3 billion has been concluded, which will allow us to double our Pepsi Cola sales by the year 2000. The company will obtain exclusive rights to sell our vodka in the United States for at least the next ten years. This is a barter deal, in other words goods for goods. In exchange for Pepsi Cola we shall sell the United States not only vodka but also ten ships, mainly tankers. The company can in its turn sell these tankers on the international market.

Referring to the fact that the agreement had to be struck on a barter basis, Pepsi Cola's executive director Donald Kendall stressed that once the convertible ruble is introduced, U.S.-Soviet trade will become easier. But he does not think that this is coming soon.

China

Wang Renzhi Discusses Soviet Ties, Reforms

PM0604163890 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 14, 9 Apr p 9

[Interview with CPC Central Committee Member Wang Renzhi, by Yuriy Starostenko; date, place not identified; first paragraph is editorial introduction: "Reforms To Be Continued"]

[Text] "Relations between the communist parties of the two countries will develop in the spirit of an agreement reached between Deng Xiaoping and Mikhail Gorbachev," Wang Renzhi said in an interview with NEW TIMES. Wang Renzhi, who is a member of the Central Committee and head of its propaganda department, led a delegation from the Communist Party of China which visited the Soviet Union a short while ago.

[Stavostenko] Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to China last May marked the normalization of relations between our countries and their communist parties. How did inter-party ties develop during this period?

[Wang] In my opinion, the relations between our two parties have been developing since then in the spirit of an agreement reached between Deng Xiaoping and Mikhail Gorbachev. We value the relations between our parties and are trying to expand ties between them because this accords with the interests of the Chinese and Soviet peoples and enriches the experience of the international working-class movement.

We believe that for the maintenance of good relations between our parties we should follow the priciples of mutual respect, full equality, and non-interference in each other's affairs. We shall follow this course, and in this way we shall be able to develop relations between our parties properly.

[Stavostenko] This was the second CPC delegation to visit Mosocw within less than a year.

[Wang] The first delegation was led by Zhu Liang, head of the Central Committee's international department. Interparty ties are to be expanded in the future.

[Stavostenko] The CPC Central Committee, meeting from March 9 to 12 of this year, adopted a decision on strengthening ties between the party and the people. How would you explain the need to give more attention to this question?

[Wang] The aim of our party's activity is to serve the people and to be useful to them. The strengthening of ties between the party and the people is an important field of work to which we pay much attention. After our party came to power, conditions appeared for it to serve the people ever better.

At the same time, the party may lose touch with the masses. That is why we want to strengthen the vital ties between the party and the people. Relying on the people, we shall be able to cope with our difficulties.

[Stavostenko] China has been carrying out reforms for more than ten years now. They have yielded good results. However, certain difficulties have arisen in the last few years. What is the situation today?

[Wang] We are continuing the policy of reforms. The experience gained over many years shows that we have no other choice. It also shows that if we turn away from a socialist direction, the reforms will lose their perspective. We are trying to ensure that the reforms advance along a socialist path.

[Stavostenko] Did they proceed in a different way in the past?

[Wang] Certainly not. But reforms are a very complicated process. There can be no simple answer: good or bad. Nevertheless, though we encounter difficulties in implementing the reforms, we are confident that we shall overcome them.

[Stavostenko] Last summer, many capitalist states introduced economic sanctions against China. How do you assess the prospects for relations between China and Western countries now?

[Wang] As you understand, the state of these relations does not fully depend on us. As for China, it will develop its relations with Western countries on the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence. We have taken a very clear stand with regard to Western sanctions. First, we are against measures of this kind. Second, we are not afraid of them. Third, in spite of all sanctions, we shall continue the policy of reforms and the expansion of ties.

[Stavostenko] Thank you for this interview.

China's NPC Proceedings End 4 Apr

PM0604142590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 6 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5

[Report by TASS correspondents A. Kirillov and V. Tomilin for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA: "Interwoven Contradictions: Chinese National People's Congress Session Ends"]

[Text] Beijing—"The climate in Beijing has certainly changed a little," our chance interlocutor, a talkative old man dressed in the traditional blue service jacket so loved by local pensioners, assured us. The cosy little park named after Sun Yat-sen, adjacent to Tiananmen Square, had very few visitors in the cool early morning.

It is certainly no ordinary spring in the Chinese capital. Hardly any sunshine, quite frequent rainy weather, no dust storms, and frequent fog. That day a sticky, whitish shroud enveloped the vast expanse of the country's main square—the guide books claim it is the biggest in the world. Outside a massive gray square building—the House of People's Assemblies—dozens of buses had formed a line; every morning they brought in deputies of the highest body of legislative power for the annual Chinese National People's Congress [NPC] session.

"Democracy, unity, realism, faith, courage in overcoming difficulties, and stability." These words, which became the session's motto, were usually heard in the auditoriums, each of which bears the name of a province, autonomous region, or major city in the PRC.

"The further stabilization of political, economic, and social life overwhelms all other tasks by its importance," Li Peng said in his report on the government's work. This principle is supported by Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, who stressed at a meeting with deputies from Shanghai: "Without a stable political environment and unity it is impossible to build an economically powerful China, whatever social system exists in our country. Only with stability can we resolve the tasks facing the country."

Many deputies believe that the "decisive measures" to stop the mass demonstrations and hunger strikes staged right there, under the windows of the House of People's Assemblies, were the decisive factor in the country's continued progression along the path of socialism.

...The determined and, at the same time, optimistic faces of young workers look down from a garish placard pasted up on enterprises and establishments all over the capital. "Having suppressed the riots, let us make good our losses," the large hieroglyphs on the placard urge. The country's leadership is perfectly well aware that, in the final analysis, the economy will be the field where the dispute with supporters of "bourgeois liberalization," "privatization of the economy," and "political pluralism" is decided. People here believe that the dispute will be a long one. Deng Xiaoping recently spoke of "20, 50, or even 70 years of struggle."

The session said that although last year's unrest has done enormous damage to the national economy, its development is following a line of improvement. Inflation and rising prices have been halted, the contradiction between public demand and supply has been eased, there has been certain improvement in the economic structure, and "there is now less confusion in the sphere of circulation."

The struggle against flaws in the market and efforts to find its optimum combination with state planning and macroeconomic control have led to a slump in economic activity: Consumer demand has fallen, there has been a sharp drop in the industrial output rate, and "a substantial number of enterprises have either closed down or are operating at half strength." "The interweaving of old and new contradictions," Li Peng said, "has intensified our problems and difficulties and made their solution more complicated."

The idea—which seemed so obvious a comparatively short time ago—that the future triumphant development of reform would take nothing more than simply "improving the economic environment," eliminating the overheating in economic growth, and regulating the private sector is now being interpreted in a far more complex context.

The Chinese leaders are convinced that the progress of China and its reforms in all spheres is indivisible from the four cardinal principles: commitment to the socialist path, to democratic dictatorship of the people, to leadership by the CPC, and to Marxism-Leninism and the ideas of Mao Zedong.

The session called for the formation of a special committee to oversee the activity of executive power. "The State Council and central ministries," Deputy Yuan Xuefen, a well known art critic, believes, "must voluntarily report back to deputies."

Propaganda heroes from 20 or 30 years ago, such as Wang Jinxi, the "man of iron" of the Daqing oilfields, and Lei Feng, the legendary "steel screw," have returned to the press, placards, and the covers of popular brochures. The "spirit of the Daqing oil workers," with their selfless labor and modest lifestyle, and the movement of "learning from Lei Feng," who "served the party and the people with all his heart and all his thoughts," have returned to agitation practice with them. These images and formulas, well familiar to the older generation of Chinese, are being extensively used today to strengthen socialist spirituality and national consolidation.

An area where the concept of national unity has strictly practical significance is the question of Hong Kong, to which deputies at the session devoted a great deal of attention. The fundamental difficulty of this question is that this capitalist enclave—currently "British property"—is to be returned to the sovereignty of socialist China in 1997.

Aixing Giorro Pu Jie, NPC deputy and younger brother of the last Chinese Emperor Pu Yi, described the restoration of Chinese sovereignty over Hong Kong as "returning an abducted child to its home." "I am ashamed of my ancestors who lost this land one and a half centuries ago," this "last of the line" of the former ruling Qing dynasty admitted. In his opinion, the principle "one state-two systems" creates the basis for the long-term prosperity of this future special administrative region of the PRC.

The session ended its work 4 April. It adopted a plan for the country's economic and social development, approved the "Basic Law on the Xianggang (Hong Kong) Special Administrative Region of the PRC," and established its future flag and emblem. It stipulates that the new status will be conferred on the present "British property" of Hong Kong on 1 July 1997.

Deputies also approved amendments to the PRC Law on Joint Enterprises. The session elected Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, as chairman of the PRC Central Military Council.

Northeast Asia

Foreign Ministry on Japanese Official's Remarks

OW1004053090 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Text] We will now broadcast a Soviet Foreign Ministry statement on the Japanese Government's remarks:

A high-ranking official of the Japanese Government recently touched on the relations between Japan and the Soviet Union at a Diet session, and talked as if there were an intensifying threat from the Soviet Union. His remarks have aroused attention in the Soviet Union.

Deputy Chief Gremitskikh of the Foreign Ministry's Information Administration touched on this remark at a briefing held in Moscow, and stated as follows:

While reducing the number of troops in the Soviet Far East, the Soviet Union has been modernizing the remaining troops and strengthening their combat capabilities. Such a groundless rumor has been circulating.

We cannot but say that it is not strange to hear a Japanese official source making such remarks recently. This can be taken as evidence that by-products of the cold war still exist among certain groups of politicians of the (?West European type). At the same time, there are other remarkable facts. That is, many more Japanese have now come to think that it is [words indistinct] to seek methods of leading Japan's relations with the Soviet Union into a broader sphere in a positive and forward-looking way.

Under such circumstances, it is [words indistinct] for the Japanese official source to continue with its military buildup as before, while simultaneously maintaining no changes had happened in the world, particularly in the Asia-Pacific region. In a word, to justify this policy, the notorious argument of the Soviet threat has been brought up once again.

Ths Soviet troops stationed in the Far East have been asked to carry out the task exclusively orientated to defense. If the Japanese side should feel any apprehension about it, the Soviet Union is ready to hold extensive talks, at whichever level and with anyone concerned, on issues related to disarmament in the Asia-Pacific region.

This is what Deputy Chief Gremitskikh of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Information Administration has stated.

Japan's Ojawa Views Relations With Soviet Union

PM1004102590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Apr 90 Second Edition p5

[Interview with Ichiro Ojawa, general secretary of the Japanese Liberal Democratic Party, by own correspondent I. Latyshev in Tokyo in April: "'I Would Go to Moscow'"—first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] By Japanese standards, I. Ojawa is still young: He is 47 years old. However, he has long experience of working in politics: He has been a parliamentary deputy for 20 years. He was elected general secretary of the party last year.

In a conversation with your correspondent, held at the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) headquarters, I. Ojawa answered questions and set out his views on the present state and prospects of development of Japanese-Soviet relations.

[Latyshev] What is your attitude to the great changes that have taken place recently in the international situation?

[Ojawa] In the postwar years international relations developed for a long time on the basis of the balance of forces achieved in U.S.-Soviet confrontation. The rest of the world found itself drawn into the system of this confrontation. Now, however, thanks to the determination and vigor of Gorbachev, who recently became president of your country, dramatic, epoch-making changes are taking place in the Soviet Union and in East European countries. It was in the course of these changes that the transition was made from strong-arm confrontation to cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States. This development of events is beneficial to the cause of peace and the progress of the world community. That is why I would once again like to stress my respect for the determination shown by President Gorbachev and other Soviet leaders. On the other hand, of course, I must also point out the difficulties of forming a new world structure at the present extremely crucial period in history. We must all work together to contribute to the successful development of events.

[Latyshev] How does the LDP leadership regard the present situation in the Asian and Pacific region and, in particular, the present state of Soviet-Japanese relations?

[Ojawa] Japan is part of Asia in both geographical and ethnic respects. So, in my opinion, we should promote the formation and development of relations of cooperation with countries in the region. The Soviet Union probably occupies the greater part of Asia and, moreover, it borders on Japan. Naturally the normalization of relations between our countries is in the interests of peace and stability in Asia. Consequently we are making decisive efforts to normalize Japanese-Soviet relations.

[Latyshev] On a recent visit to Moscow, Mr. Shintaro Abe, eminent leader of the LDP, put forward a program to develop Soviet-Japanese cooperation. How does the general secretary of the LDP regard this program?

[Ojawa] Mr. Shintaro Abe, who until recently held the post of general secretary of the LDP, took the first major step during his visit to the Soviet Union toward a new stage in the development of Japanese-Soviet relations by putting forward an eight-point program that could be implemented during cooperation between the two sides. The LDP has now begun preparations to implement the idea of inviting a group of young Soviet people to study in Japan, and we are now coordinating this question with government departments in order to enlist their assistance. We also feel it necessary to implement the other points in the program.

[Latyshev] How do you feel about the contacts that have taken shape recently between the ruling Japanese LDP and the CPSU?

[Ojawa] It is good. Our contacts will help to develop Japanese-Soviet relations. I am in favor of developing bilateral cooperation at both government and party levels.

[Latyshev] Reports of your intention to visit the Soviet Union have appeared in the press.

[Ojawa] I personally do not like travelling anywhere. So I rarely go abroad. But if the Soviet side were to invite me, I would go. I would use my time in Moscow for talks on the eight points proposed by Mr. Abe and on some other matters which could start to be tackled. At the same time, I would like a frank exchange of opinions on fundamental problems of Japanese-Soviet relations. To be more specific, I would like to reach mutual understanding on the border problem and on problems of economic cooperation and also discuss channels for cultural exchange and some other issues.

[Latyshev] How do you feel about the discussion of problems connected with reducing arms in the Asian and Pacific region and, in particular, the problems raised by M.S. Gorbachev in his speech in Krasnoyarsk?

[Ojawa] These problems are connected with safeguarding peace and stability and with security guarantees in the Far East and Asia. They affect the basic principles of the two countries' policies. Of course they should be discussed.

[Latyshev] USSR President M.S. Gorbachev is planning a visit to Japan in 1991. How do you feel about this?

[Ojawa] It goes without saying that our party and the Japanese people will wholeheartedly welcome this visit. I would like to assist the preparations for this event and do everything possible to ensure that the Soviet president's meetings with the Japanese prime minister give a new boost to the development of our relations.

[Latyshev] What hopes are you pinning on the future development of ties between Japan and the Soviet Union?

[Ojawa] Free elections are now being held in the Soviet Union on the basis of democratic principles. Democracy presupposes the sides' mutual readiness to listen to each other and take steps to meet each other halfway. This also applies to Japanese-Soviet differences of opinion on the territorial problem. So far, the Japanese side has refused to discuss questions of future cooperation between our countries until the four islands illegally taken over by the Soviet Union are returned to it. And the Soviet side has insisted that there can be no talks on the territorial issue because this problem has already been solved. Under these circumstances it is hardly likely that any progress will be made in bringing our views closer together. That is why I believe that we must hold talks and be willing to make mutual concessions. Otherwise we will not make any headway at all. Japan should therefore change the stand it has taken with regard to the Soviet Union for a long time. And the Soviet Union must do the same. Points of contact will then appear in our standpoints.

[Latyshev] Would it be right to say that these changes in your views have been brought about under the influence of the changes in the international situation?

[Ojawa] Yes, perhaps that is what it ultimately comes down to. We now realize that the problems of Japanese-Soviet relations must be resolved in the context of the general easing of tension. It is probably also true that moods in favor of overcoming differences and taking a more flexible approach than before have become stronger in your own country? I feel that this is the right time for settling disputes.

As you can see, my statements do not coincide with diplomats' cautious pronouncements. But I am not a diplomat, after all, and I believe that we must speak frankly with one another, not concealing what we really think.

[Latyshev] And how do you feel about the idea of a third path: the path of constructive dialogue in the development of our bilateral relations, suggested by A.N. Yakovlev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, during his visit to Japan?

[Ojawa] Mr. Yakovlev expressed this idea in a conversation with me. It was during that conversation that I had a particularly keen sense of the need for both the Soviet Union and Japan to show flexibility in their approach to disputes.

[Latyshev] In conclusion, I would like to hear your opinion on perestroyka in the Soviet Union and on the recent political events connected with changes in our country's constitution and state structure.

[Ojawa] I regard perestroyka as a series of historic, epoch-making reforms. Of course, the Soviet Union is currently encountering very serious internal difficulties. But these difficulties are surmountable. This also applies to the situation in Lithuania. A reasonable way to settle the dispute—through mutual concession and compromise—can be found there on the basis of dialogue. Given all the circumstances, the transition to democracy means a fundamental upheaval in the life of Soviet society, to which there has been no equal in significance in all the 70 years that have passed since the 1917 revolution. This event will have an impact on the course of Soviet and world history. Consequently, we are pinning great hopes on the success of perestroyka. As far as foreign policy issues are concerned, the Japanese-U.S. alliance has been and must remain the basis of Japanese diplomacy. So we intend to develop Japanese-Soviet relations without weakening our alliance with the United States. Under those terms I hope to deepen trust and cooperation between Japan and the Soviet Union. I wholeheartedly wish the Soviet side successes in the restructuring reforms being implemented in your country today. We are ready to contribute to them.

Doi's Remarks on Six-Nation Meeting Welcomed

OW1004055290 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Commentary by Ovchinnikov, PRAVDA political commentator]

[Text] Chairperson Takako Doi of the Japan Socialist Party [JSP] delivered an opening speech at the JSP regular session held recently. In this speech, she stated that the Soviet Union, the United States, Japan, China, and both South and North Korea [Namboku Chosen] should sit down at a table to talk about the issues on establishing trust and promoting disarmament in East Asia. In this connection, PRAVDA political commentator Ovchinnikov writes as follows:

It deserves special mention that the leader of Japan's powerful opposition party should share the same view as Prime Minister Kaifu. In his policy speech to the Diet, Prime Minister Kaifu indicated a positive approach to holding an international conference on the Asia-Pacific issue. He said that, as a first step, the above-mentioned six nations should hold consultations on easing tension in the Korean Peninsula.

Prime Minister Kaifu's and Chairperson Doi's remarks on holding a six-nation conference have aroused attention, because they almost coincide with items three and seven of the programs first proposed by the Soviet Union in Krasnoyarsk. I would like to remind you that Mr. Gorbachev made a speech in Krasnoyarsk in 1988. Concerning the issue of reducing military confrontation between the Soviet Union, China, Japan, North Korea [Kita Chosen], and the ROK [Kankoku], he made proposals for freezing the level of both the navy and air force, for duly reducing troops, and for holding talks among nations on limiting troop activities. He also proposed that talks should be held on the mechanism for talks on security in the Asia-Pacific region. The six-nation conference mentioned by Prime Minister Kaifu and Chairperson Doi will serve as the foundation for creating mechanism for such consultations. The six nations include the five nations mentioned at Krasnoyarsk, plus the United States.

So far, those connected with the Japanese Government have avoided mentioning the idea of collective consultations on the issue of security in the Pacific. Rather than starting the process of collective consultations on Asia, they have insisted on the need to settle regional problems, including the so-called northern territorial issue, first. In this connection, it is noteworthy that Prime Minister Kaifu of the Japanese Government, as well as Chairperson Doi of the JSP, the powerful opposition party in Japan, have stated that Japan is ready to hold multinational talks on problems in Asia.

Ivashko Talks With Japanese Envoy

LD0404212690 Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 0230 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] Yesterday Ivashko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Central Committee of Ukraine's Communist Party, received (Kawakami), emissary extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Japanese Embassy in the Soviet Union, at the latter's request. Questions connected with Soviet-Japanese relations and the course of political and economic reform in the Ukraine were touched upon during the conversation. (Kawakami) expounded the known Japanese position linking mutual economic relations with the Soviet Union with resolving the so-called territorial problem and the concluding of a peace treaty between Japan and the Soviet Union.

Ivashko stressed the role of economic cooperation, cultural ties, and contacts between people for the improvement of mutual understanding between peoples. He stressed that Ukraine, moving towards its own political and economic sovereignty, is ready for the development of mutually beneficial cooperation with Japan in various fields. (Kawakami) expressed interest in this proposition

The conversation was businesslike and frank. (Merkulov), chief of the foreign liaison department of the Central Committee of Ukraine's Communist Party, took part.

Asia-Pacific Talks Called 'Worthy of Note'

PM0904095990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Apr 90 Second Edition p 6

[V. Ovchinnikov "Rejoinder": "Beginning With Six?"]

[Text] Opening the latest Japanese Socialist Party [JSP] Congress recently, Takako Doi, chairman of the JSP Central Executive Committee, made what I consider to be an important statement. She said that the Soviet Union, the United Sates, Japan, China, and North and South Korea should get around a table to exchange opinions on confidence-building measures in Eastern Asia and disarmament problems in the region.

It is significant that the statement by the leader of the country's largest opposition party coincides with the opinion of the head of government. During the discussion of the incumbent cabinet's program in parliament, Prime Minister Kaifu expressed a positive attitude regarding the convocation of an international conference on Asian-Pacific problems. He described talks between the aforementioned six countries to reduce tension on the Korean Peninsula as the first step toward this.

In my view, what Kaifu and Doi have said in favor of six-sided talks merits attention since it is in many respects consonant with the third and seventh points of the Soviet program made public in Krasnoyarsk. Let me recall that, speaking there in 1988, M.S. Gorbachev proposed discussing on a multilateral basis the question of reducing military confrontation in the areas where the borders of the USSR, the PRC, Japan, the DPRK, and South Korea converge with a view to freezing and proportionally reducing the levels and limiting the activity of naval and air forces. It was also proposed that the question of a negotiating mechanism on security problems in Asia and the Pacific be discussed. I think that the six-sided talks mentioned by Kaifu and Doi (involving the five countries listed in Krasnoyarsk, plus the United States) could begin the establishment of such a mechanism.

Official Tokyo circles have hitherto declined to collectively discuss the problems of Pacific security. They have claimed that regional conflicts, including "the northern territories question," should supposedly be settled before beginning something like the common European process in Asia. So the readiness for a multilateral exchange of opinions on Asian affairs expressed by the head of the Japanese Government and the leader of the largest opposition party is worthy of note.

USSR Efforts in Asia's Demilitarization Noted

LD0604053190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1124 GMT 5 Apr 90

[By Vladimir Chernyshev, TASS observer on military questions]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 5 Apr—Iodzo Ichikawa, chief of the Japan Defense Agency, when speaking at the budget commission of the parliament's lower house, stated there is still a Soviet military threat in the Asian Pacific Region. I think in the present conditions an allegation like this could not sound more strange. The whole world knows the concrete practical steps the USSR is undertaking in Asia to reduce tension there. [passage omitted]

What else is surprising is the allegation that the USSR is so absorbed in tackling its internal problems that it is in no state to discuss now questions concerning disarmament in the Asian Pacific Region. Here too, the claims of the Japanese representative is in conflict with reality. The measures proposed by Mikhail Gorbachev in Vladivostok in 1986 and Krasnoyarsk in 1988, and which are geared to a curtailment of the arms race in the Asian Pacific Region, to reduction here of naval and other armaments, and to strengthening of trust in the military sphere, have in the meantime been supplemented and developed into a well-structured platform. It covers various aspects of demilitarization in the region and development of relations of good-neighborliness and cooperation there. [passage omitted]

Thus, for its part, the USSR is doing all it can to improve the military strategic situation in the Asian Pacific Region. What is Japan doing? Is it making any positive contribution to this process? Regrettably, the position of official Tokyo does not inspire optimism. Some, I would say, strange facts draw attention.

In December 1989 the Japanese Foreign Ministry prepared recommendations for Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu, which express a positive attitude toward the Soviet proposal on holding talks on questions concerning the provision of security. However, in March of this year the Foreign Policy Department stated holding talks in Asian Pacific Region on arms control [kontrol nad vooruzheniyami] and disarmament similar to the ones being held in Europe must be preceded by "a political solution" of a number of problems, including "the problems of Northern territories," the situation on the Korean peninsula and the Cambodian problem. What is more, after consultations with U.S. representatives, it was announced that Tokyo and Washington have reached consensus that the use in Asian Pacific Region of a system of talks similar to the European one would be "premature."

Thus, it would seem the policy of the U.S. Administration, which does not wish to begin any talks whatsoever on reduction of arms in the Asian Pacific region, is exerting a certain influence on Japan. However, there is also another reason, in my view. The Japan Defense Agency is completing the drafting of a regular five-year program for the development of the armed forces in that country. According to a preliminary estimate, its implementation will cost not less than 23 trillion yen. How can one obtain such an astronomic sum if the "Soviet threat" is vanishing and one will have to begin talks on reduction in military confrontation in Asian Pacific Region?

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Prospect of Thailand-PRC-SRV Talks Viewed

BK0804055090 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Station observer Oleg Alekseyev commentary]

[Text] As reported by newspapers in Bangkok, Thai Prime Minister Chatchai Chunhawan has instructed the Foreign Ministry to start preparing for a meeting in Bangkok of representatives of Thailand, China, and Vietnam on the Cambodian problem. Here are comments by our observer, Comrade Oleg Alekseyev:

The idea of organizing such a meeting was meticulously discussed a few days ago during the trip to Vietnam by Chawalit Yongchaiyut, currently deputy prime minister and defense minister of Thailand. The two sides concluded that talks among representatives of Vietnam, Thailand, and China will effectively contribute to solving the Cambodian problem. Without wasting time, the Thai Government has decided to start concretizing this idea. As Bangkok newspapers have noted on this issue, China has so far adopted an unclear stance.

According to Thai Foreign Minister Sitthi Sawetsila, who returned a few days ago from Beijing, the Chinese leadership has made it known that it is not yet ready to hold talks with Thailand and Vietnam on the Cambodian problem. As for the Thai prime minister, he thinks that it is just a matter of time. In the next few days [as heard], a Vietnamese deputy foreign minister will go to Beijing to specially talk about the idea of a tripartite meeting. In Sitthi Sawetsila's words, there is now a sufficient basis to expect that an agreement will be reached and the tripartite meeting will take place.

What would this idea—to which Bangkok has paid great attention—bring once it materializes? Making predictions would not be wise. However, we would like to make some remarks.

The situation in Cambodia, if left to develop without active international assistance, cannot be normalized. The leadership in Phnom Penh and reasonable personalities on the opposition side understand this. There is now an agreement to use UN Administration as a transitional element to carry out a number of tasks in Cambodia, primarily to organize general and free elections there. Preliminary steps are being taken toward concretizing this. It is obvious that the UN mission in Cambodia can bear fruit only with a prior agreement to a cease-fire. A campaign of fighting was actively waged by the opposing Cambodian side in the third quarter of last year with the complete withdrawal of Vietnamese troops.

Therefore, it seems that the talks among China, Vietnam, and Thailand have a role because these countries certainly have real possibilities to end the conflict:

China, with its close relations with the opposing Cambodian side; Thailand, through whose territory weapons have been supplied to the opposing Cambodian side; and Vietnam, as a Cambodian neighbor, has close relations with the government in Phnom Penh. Thus, those who have paid attention to restoring peace in Cambodia have the right to place high hopes in the future tripartite meeting.

Nikolayev Comments on Hun Sen Message to Sihanouk

BK1004040990 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 9 Apr 90

[Station commentator Aleksey Nikolayev article]

[Text] Comrade Hun Sen, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the State of Cambodia, has proposed that a talk should be held prior to the coming meeting of the warring Cambodian parties. According to the Cambodian mass media, Comrade Hun Sen has sent a message to Samdech Norodom Sihanouk. In this message, Comrade Hun Sen stressed that this talk would contribute to breaking the deadlock in the search for a solution to the Cambodian problem. Our commentator, Comrade Aleksey Nikolayev, wrote an article which says:

Many observers regard Comrade Hun Sen's message as Phnom Penh's agreement in principle to continue dialogue with the Cambodian opposition groups.

It was learned that last week, Samdech Norodom Sihanouk suggested that a meeting of representatives of the warring groups be held in Bangkok on 15 April. This suggestion was accepted amid doubts among Thai official circles in general. The meeting might be held, but the question is whether this meeting will bring any concrete results. It was learned that the informal meeting in Jakarta ended in a deadlock due to the conflict of opinions between Phnom Penh and the Cambodian opposition groups.

The current first task is to settle the problems related to the internal aspect of the government. It was stated in Comrade Hun Sen's message that the leadership of the State of Cambodia stressed that there is no need to hasten the new meeting and that a talk should be held beforehand. An important condition is that Comrade Hun Sen is ill. It has been stressed in Phnom Penh that it is correct to postpone the meeting of the four Cambodian parties and that, for the time being, it is necessary to hold discussions to exchange views with each other first.

The head of government of the State of Cambodia has assessed the prospects for another meeting following this discussion. A similar meeting held in Bangkok in February was quite successful. It should be recalled that at that meeting, the participants signed a statement saying they advocated the formation of a national supreme council serving as an organization to symbolize Cambodia's sovereignty and national unity and supported the UN role in the settlement of the Cambodian problem.

Tokyo can also be another avenue for a new round of talks between Comrade Hun Sen and Samdech Norodom Sihanouk. This matter was discussed during Thai Prime Minister Chatchai Chunhawan's visit to Japan.

During talks with the Thai prime minister, Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu welcomed this good idea and promised to consider it thoroughly.

A favorable condition has been created. In this condition, dialogue among the Cambodian factions may be held in one form or another. We hope that this will help to expedite the effort toward national reconciliation and peace in Cambodia.

Afghan 'Opposition' Releases Soviet Soldier

LD1004094190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0800 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] Kabul, 10 Apr (TASS)—Today, in compliance with a decree by Najibullah, the president of the Republic of Afghanistan, former Soviet soldier Aleksey Tikhonov was handed over to officials of the USSR Embassy in Kabul, in the Afghan Foreign Ministry. He was held prisoner for four years by one of the armed formations of the Afghan opposition.

Present at the ceremony were Baqi Samandari, the Afghan deputy foreign minister, B.N. Pastukhov, the USSR ambassador to Afghanistan, and Afghan officials and workers from the Soviet Embassy. The USSR ambassador expressed his profound gratitude to the Afghan side for its active actions in freeing the former Soviet soldier.

Bibit's Escape in Philippines Viewed

HK1104040390 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Commentary by Anatoliy Aleksandrov]

[Text] Retired Police Lieutenant Colonel Billy Bibit and other prisoners have escaped from detention after they were arrested recently for their involvement in the aborted coup d'etat aimed at toppling the Aquino government last December. Reports say the plan to spring Bibit was well organized. This was carried out during a party held in the jail. During that occasion, 15 masked and armed men easily opened the jail door and released the prisoners. According to a report made by a police sergeant, Col. Bibit seemed prepared to make the break. The precinct quickly came under the control of the armed men, who overpowered the local guards and cut communications lines so that the authorities could not be contacted.

This escape by Bibit only shows how some influential groups in the Philippines operate—making it easy for prisoners to escape detention. This was highlighted by General Renato de Villa, Armed Forces chief of staff, when he discussed a recent message sent by Gringo

Honasan, which said that detained officers would be sprung. Gringo, who continues to be in hiding to this day, himself escaped from detention through the help of his captors.

At present, no one can say where Bibit might be hiding. President Corazon Aquino has ordered an extensive hunt for the colonel and his companions.

Meanwhile, the government continues to investigate the sixth coup attempt mounted against the Aquino government—the last one being the bloodiest of all. Many of the men suspected of involvement were arrested, including Col. Bibit, who was accused of supplying arms to the rebel soldiers.

Western press reports cite the possibility of another coup d'etat taking place in the country. How serious is this? We do not know, since there are various opinions on the matter. But one thing is clear: Bibit's escape can only fuel further instability in the country, particularly with respect to the Philippines' international reputation.

Meanwhile, the Philippines continue to address itself to serious matters, such as the talks dealing with the future of the American military bases. These talks were unable to get under way because of the coup attempt. The men behind the coup attempt have shown that their acts can influence the decision on the bases to be made by the present government of President Corazon Aquino.

CPV Delegation Studies CPSU Education

PM1004104190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] In accordance with the plan for interparty ties between the CPSU and the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV], a delegation of CPV party workers headed by Dang Quoc Bao, chief of the CPV Central Committee Science and Educational Establishments Department, was in the Soviet Union 30 March through 8 April to familiarize itself with the CPSU's practical work in the sphere of science and education under the conditions of perestroyka.

The Vietnamese comrades had meetings and talks at the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department, the CPSU Central Committee Social Sciences Academy and Marxism-Leninism Institute, the USSR Academy of Sciences, the USSR State Committee for Public Education, and a number of the country's leading scientific and educational establishments, and toured the Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic].

The delegation was received by A.S. Kapto, member of the CPSU Central Committee and chief of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department.

Near East & South Asia

Reportage on Lukyanov's 6-8 Apr Visit to India

Lukyanov, Gujral Hold Talks

LD0604151990 Moscow TASS in English 0956 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] New Delhi Apr 6 TASS—USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov and Indian Foreign Minister Inder Kumar Gujral discussed here today the state and prospects of Soviet-Indian relations and certain pressing international problems. The sides expressed the desire to further promote interaction in various areas in order to strengthen friendship and cooperation between the two states, to ensure a lasting peace in Asia and all over the world.

Lukyanov and Gujral expressed the hope that perestroyka in the Soviet Union and positive changes in the international arena would be used effectively to further develop bilateral relations in economy, commerce, science, technology and culture. They declared their readiness to strengthen contacts between the two countries at different levels, including parliamentary relations, in order to expand the sphere of international mutual understanding and cooperation and to promote progress in disarmament in keeping with the new political thinking, reflected in the Soviet-Indian declaration on principles of a nuclear-weapons-free and non-violent world.

Touching on the situation in the region, Lukyanov noted that the Soviet Union was striving to implement by concrete deeds the Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk initiatives in the Asian-Pacific region, which will contribute to security and stability in that part of the world. He reaffirmed the Soviet view that the Kashmir issue should be settled by political means. The head of the soviet Government said the Soviet Union, which has fully carried out its commitments under the Geneva accords, was prepared to exert maximum efforts to stop the bloodshed in Afghanistan as quickly as possible.

Gujral said India resented continuing outside interference in Afghanistan's affairs and believed the Afghan people should be given the right to decide their future themselves.

Today Lukyanov received Parvathanemi Upendra, the Indian minister of parliamentary affairs, information and broadcasting. The sides noted the importance of further promoting relations between the Soviet and Indian parliaments and their committees, of exchanging visits of Parliamentarians—experts in various fields of knowledge.

Lukyanov also received Rajiv Gandhi, chairman of the Indian National Congress (I) and leader of the parliamentary opposition.

Delhi Meetings, Activities Reported

PM0904092190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Apr 90 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Meetings in Delhi"]

[Text] Delhi, 5 Apr—The friendship and fruitful cooperation between the USSR and India accord not only with the two countries' mutual interests but also serve the cause of strengthening peace and security in Asia and the world as a whole. This was confirmed at a meeting today by Indian Prime Minister Vishwanath Pratap Singh and A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, who is paying an official visit here. During the conversation, which took place in a spirit of friendship and mutual interest, the sides exchanged opinions on a broad range of questions relating to Soviet-Indian relations and discussed international problems of mutual interest.

Stressing India's devotion to the further development and deepening of friendly ties with the Soviet Union, V.P. Singh said that "they do not reflect the policy of a particular government or party but the will of the whole Indian people."

A.I. Lukyanov pointed out that the USSR and India have good prospects and opportunities to further increase the potential of their friendly relations in the most diverse spheres. The USSR-Indian Treaty on Peace, Friendship, and Cooperation, along with the Delhi Declaration on Principles of a Nuclear-Free and Nonviolent World, which is a concrete manifestation of the new political thinking, serve as a firm foundation for this.

Both sides expressed a desire to continue to cooperate in the international arena with a view to strengthening universal peace and security and developing positive trends in the Asia-Pacific region. The chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet stressed the well-known Soviet stance on the settlement of the situation around Kashmir.

A.I. Lukyanov and V.P. Singh stressed the importance and usefulness of regular meetings between the two countries' leaders and other mutual contacts at various levels, including the parliamentary level.

A.I. Lukyanov held a meeting here today with Indian Vice President Shankar Dayal Sharma in the atmosphere of sincere warmth and cordiality characteristic of Soviet-Indian relations. During the conversation they stressed the importance of preserving and increasing the traditional friendship and multifaceted cooperation between the USSR and India in the interests of the two countries' peoples and in order to strengthen universal peace.

Speaking about the roots of Indian-Soviet friendship, S.D. Sharma pointed out that it gained momentum even prior to the Great October Socialist Revolution during the struggle for Indian national liberation. We highly value the fact that the Soviet Union offered us crucial support in creating the foundations of our national industry, power engineering, and other sectors, India's vice president said.

S.D. Sharma described the Soviet-Indian Declaration on the Principles of a Nuclear-Free and Nonviolent World, signed in 1986, as an "important milestone in international politics."

Touching on perestroyka in the USSR, A.I. Lukyanov described the processes that are taking place as a revolution that is encompassing all spheres of life—political, economic, legal, and spiritual. We are now striving, he said, to utilize the experience of all democracies, including such a major democracy as India.

The chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Indian vice president, who is the chairman of the Government Assembly—the upper chamber of the republic's parliament—spoke in favor of deepening and broadening contacts between the country's supreme representative bodies and ensuring their more active participation in resolving concrete tasks of USSR-Indian cooperation. The participants in the conversation pointed out the importance of joint efforts by parliamentarians to ensure peace, security, and stability on the planet, including above all the Asia-Pacific region. S.D. Sharma spoke with approval of A.I. Lukyanov's proposal to consider the possibility of holding a meeting of members of parliament from the states of Asia and the Pacific basin to this end and supported the idea that the positive changes which are taking place in international relations in Europe should be extended to the whole Eurasian area.

The chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet invited S.D. Sharma to visit the Soviet Union at a convenient time. The invitation was accepted with thanks.

In the evening S.D. Sharma gave a dinner in honor of the Soviet guest and his retinue. Exchanging friendly toasts, A.I. Lukyanov and India's vice president confirmed their two countries' desire to further develop their relations of friendship and cooperation. The dinner was attended by members of the Indian Government and leaders of various political parties represented in the country's parliament.

Today the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet continued his familiarization with the Indian capital. He visited the historic Red Fort, where the flag of independent India was raised for the first time more than 40 years ago. The Soviet guest familiarized himself with the Jawaharlal Nehru museum house. He wrote the following in the honored visitors' book: "The name of Jawaharlal Nehru—India's first prime minister and the architect of modern India—has always been dear and close to Soviet people." Today he visited the Indira Gandhi Memorial, paying a respectful tribute to the memory of this outstanding daughter of the Indian people.

Lukyanov Tours India

LD0604165690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0940 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Delhi, 6 Apr (TASS)—A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, who is in India on a visit, left this afternoon on a trip around the country. He is accompanied by Shivraj Patil, deputy speaker of the People's (Lower) Assembly of the Indian parliament.

Rabi Ray, speaker of the People's Assembly, and other officials saw off Lukyanov at Delhi airport. The chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet will visit Agra and Bombay, the administrative center of the state of Maharashtra.

Arrives in Bombay 6 Apr

LD0604231290 Moscow TASS in English 2112 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Bombay, Maharashtra April 7 TASS—Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and alternate member of the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee who is staying in India on a visit, arrived on Friday evening in Bombay, administrative centre of the State of Maharashtra. At the airport he was welcomed by Ch. Subramaniam, governor of the state, Maharashtra Chief Minister Sharad Pawar and other officials.

The programme of the visit includes a meeting with heads of both chambers of the Maharashtra Legislative Assembly, a visit to the Maharashtra governor, a visit to M. Gandhi's memorial museum and the seeing the sights of bombay. Lukyanov and the officials who accompany him will leave for home on Sunday.

Visit to Bombay Reported

LD0804102590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 7 Apr 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] During his official visit to India Comrade Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, has been on a trip around the country. [video shows casually-dressed, Lukyanov emerging from temple with Indian hosts, then shots of Taj Mahal]

[Correspondent Levchenko] In the town of Agra, 200 km from the capital, Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov looked around some unique monuments of Indian history and architecture. The so-called dead city of Fatehpur Sikri, built in the 16th century during the rule of the Emperor Akbar, impresses even today with its size and elegance. Also found in Agra is one of the most remarkable monuments of the Indian middle ages—the Taj Mahal mausoleum. The Soviet visitor was told all the riddles and legends associated with the history of the construction of this burial chamber of the Emperor Shah Jahan and his wife Mumtaz. [Video shows street scenes of Bombay, then Lukyanov formally dressed at indoor meetings with local officials and with the state governor.]

Not much time at all, a mere day and a half, has been set aside in the program of the visit for his stay in Bombay, capital of the state of Maharashtra and one of India's major economic and cultural centres. Here Comrade Lukyanov continued what he regards as his important and very useful meetings with Indian parliamentarians, this time at state level. At Maharashtra's legislative assembly, Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov conversed with the chief minister of the state, with the chairman of the legislative assembly, its speaker, and with the leader of the opposition. Many questions concerning the activities of the legislative and government bodies of the states making up the Indian union were raised.

The chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the figures accompanying him were recieved by the governor of the state of Maharashtra. Under the Indian constitution state governors represent supreme presidential authority and possess quite broad powers. [video shows Lukyanov again casually dressed, alighting from a pleasure boat, viewing building carved from rock, meeting tourists in a park.]

In the few hours allocated for getting to know the huge city of Bombay with its many aspects, Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov visited an ancient temple complex on Elephant Island in the Bay of Bombay. True, even here the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet was obliged to return to domestic matters, as an unscheduled meeting with Soviet tourists recalled the difficult and important matters with which our country is dealing at the present time.

Lukyanov Meets Maharashtra Leaders

PM1004093390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS dispatch: "Visit Ends"]

[Text] Bombay, 7 Apr—The most important impression which we have gained in the course of the encounters on Indian soil is the awareness that India will continue to steer the course which was set four decades by not just the governments but also the peoples of our two countries, A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, said today. In a conversation held here with the leadership of both houses of the Maharashtra state legislative assembly, the head of the Soviet parliament noted that his five-day official visit had enabled him to "feel the pulse" of present-day India.

"We are leaving," A.I. Lukyanov said, "firmly convinced that it is necessary to consistently and persistently follow the path of the accords reached during M.S. Gorbachev's visits to India and to build on what is enshrined in the Soviet-Indian Treaty of Peace, Friendship, and Cooperation and in the Delhi Declaration of the principles for a nuclear-free and nonviolent world."

During the conversation, which took place in an atmosphere of cordiality and mutual interest, stress was placed on the importance of the development of ties not just between the supreme representative organs of the two countries but also at the level of Soviet republics and Indian states and local soviets and municipal authorities, including sister cities such as Leningrad and Bombay, for instance. At the same time, attention was drawn to the need to give these contacts a concrete and practical content with a view to resolving tasks in the economic, scientific, technological, and cultural sphere.

Sharad Pawar, chief minister of Maharashtra State, noted that state legislative assembly deputies are keenly interested in the profound changes under way in the USSR. Rating highly M.S. Gorbachev's role in developing the perestroyka process and imparting a fresh impetus to Soviet-Indian political and economic relations and the two countries' collaboration in the international arena, he wished the Soviet people success in the cause of the renewal of all spheres of life. A.I. Lukyanov and those accompanying him paid a call on C. Subramaniam, governor of Maharashtra state. In the ensuing conversation both sides reaffirmed the desire to develop and enrich friendly relations between India and the Soviet Union with due account for the changes in the international atmosphere and the growing importance of Asia and the Pacific region as an economic center of the planet.

In the evening the governor of Maharashtra gave a reception in honor of the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and those accompanying him.

Terms Visit 'Useful'

PM1004090990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5

["Our Interview" with A.I. Lukyanov by PRAVDA Correspondents V. Baykov and I. Sharov: "USSR-India: Maintaining the Impetus"—date and place not specified—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, is paying an official visit to India. PRAVDA correspondents V. Baykov and I. Sharov asked him a number of questions about the visit's aims and results.

Its main aim, A.I. Lukyanov said, is to further boost the positive results already achieved in relations between our countries. Their firm basis is the 1971 Treaty on Peace, Friendship, and Cooperation and the historic 1986 Delhi Declaration.

India is a great South Asian power which plays a perceptible role in the international arena. And we have a vital interest in ensuring that the dynamism of our multifaceted ties, which were given new impetus during M.S. Gorbachev's visit to that country, is maintained come what may. But, regrettably, that dynamism has been seen to decline recently. That is why the Presidential Council has adopted a decision that the new Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's first visit will be to India.

The days of the brief but busy visit to India were filled with intensive talks, meetings, and conversations. First and foremost in the parliamentary sphere. We met with R. Rey, speaker of the Lok Sabha—the People's Assembly [lower house] of the Indian parliament—attended sittings of the present parliamentary session, and, I must say, found many similarities with our practice of conducting debates: There was much passion and quick-temperedness in the deputies' speeches. In short, they were interesting debates.

There was a conversation with a large group of parliamentarians from different political parties. It was a frank and businesslike discussion. The joint desire to find keen forms of contacts between our parliaments and their committees and commissions was expressed and to broaden communication between organizations and ordinary people.

There was a very full and detailed conversation with Indian Prime Minister V.P. Singh. We touched on a number of important problems. First and foremost, questions connected with the further consolidation and expansion of traditional multifaceted relations in various spheres—policy, the economy, culture, and parliamentary ties. We examined in detail prospects for our economic, scientific, and technical cooperation by means of production-sharing, integration, and the creation of joint ventures.

We paid great attention to interethnic problems in our country and India. In particular, we expressed our attitude quite categorically toward events in Kashmir which we regard as a purely internal affair for the Indian side. This question must be resolved on the basis of the 1972 Indian-Pakistani agreement in Simla without being given an international coloring. We support the firm but at the same time restrained policy of the Indian leadership, which is seeking to resolve this question by political means avoiding strong-arm methods.

During the conversation emphasis was placed on the important idea that the Indian side speaks from a position of continuity in our relations and deepens and expands them.

There was also a meeting with S.D. Sharma, vice president of India; K.I. Gujral, foreign minister; and R. Gandhi, leader of the parliamentary opposition.

Our trip reaffirms the important conclusion that the South Asia region is of such great significance for world development. This is a region of the future. Anyone who does not understand that is simply not looking ahead. It is here that the economy of the 21st century is being formed on a renewed scientific and technical basis. The four well known Asian "tigers" are rapidly being joined by Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand. India's role is growing appreciably here. Failing to look toward this dynamically developing world means failing to develop oneself. Our country is also an Asian power and therefore our interest in strengthening relations with this region is understandable. We will follow this path determinedly. In this respect our visit to India was useful.

Final Day in India Reviewed

LD0904041890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1052 GMT 8 Apr 90

[Report by TASS Correspondent Sergey Karmalito]

[Excerpts] Bombay, 8 Apr— The official visit to India at the invitation of the country's leadership by A.I. Lukyanov, USSR Supreme Soviet chairman and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, ended today with a visit to places close to the heart of every Indian and which are connected with the history of the national liberation movement. The head of the Soviet parliament visited the Mani Bhavan memorial, the house and museum where Mahatma Gandhi lived from 1917 to 1934. He also laid a wreath at the monument to those who fell in the struggle for India's independence.

In the morning Sharad Pawar, chief minister of the government of the State of Maharashtra, gave a luncheon in honor of A.I. Lukyanov and the persons accompanying him. Present were Jyoti Basu and E.K. Nayanar, chief ministers of the governments of the states of West Bengal and Kerala, where left-wing forces are in power, and ministers of the Govenment of Maharashtra.

In the afternoon A.I. Lukyanov left for his home country. At Bombay airport the USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman was seen off by Shivraj Patil, deputy speaker of the People's Assembly (lower house) of the Indian parliament, and members of the government and legislative assembly of the State of Maharashtra. Among the seeing-off party were V.F. Isakov, USSR ambassador to India, and V.N. Yegorov, USSR consul general in Bombay. Leaving together with A.I. Lukyanov were USSR people's deputies accompanying him on the trip: Yu.P Platonov, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Construction and Architecture and first secretary of the Board of the USSR Union of Architects, Yu.V. Skokov, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Economic Reform, and Yu.M Vorontsov, USSR first deputy minister of foreign affairs. [passage omitted]

Lukyanov Summarizes Results

LD0804213790 Moscow TASS in English 1456 GMT 8 Apr 90

[Text] Bombay April 8 TASS—We regarded it as our main task to impart a new impulse to cooperation between our two countries in all fields and to fill with real, business meaning the agreements reached during Mikhail Gorbachev's visits to India, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Anatoliy Lukyanov said in an interview with TASS, discussing the outcome of his official visit to India at the invitation of the leadership of that country.

Assessing the results of his meetings and talks with Indian leaders of various levels, Lukyanov noted that they reconfirmed the two countries' desire to continue deepening bilateral cooperation.

It is of particular importance today to view realistically processes in relations between the Soviet Union and India, Lukyanov said. Soviet-Indian cooperation embraces a variety of areas, it is cooperation between the two nations, not only between their governments and other bodies of power—both central and at the level of republics and states and cities. But the fabric of economic relations needs further strengthening by weaving into it the strong threads of links betwen enterprises, production integration and cooperation, mutual accounts and contacts in the most advanced fields of scientific and technological progress.

Perestroyka in the Soviet Union opens broad possibilitiesa for this, Lukyanov said. It gives second wind to the economy, enables thousands of enterprises, organisations and cooperatives to participate more actively in international relations. We must work thoroughly along these lines.

Perestroyka also implies plurality of opinions, and consequently a search for various ways of interaction between states. It implies creative endeavour and new prospects in the development of cultural, scientific and other contacts. And, finally, in the international field, perestroyka means new political thinking which was epitomized in the Delhi declaration signed by the leaders of India and the Soviet Union.

In this field, too, perestroyka bears an immense potential for joint actions by our two countries in the name of mankind's progress towards a nuclear-free, non-violent world.

This implies first of all the development of bilateral friendly relations, active cooperation in settling regional conflicts, including the war in Afghanistan and the Cambodian problem.

There are possibilities for active participation of the USSR and India in implementing international initiatives advanced by the United Nations and the Non-Aligned Movement.

Summing up the results of the visit from the point of view of the development of links between representative bodies of power of the Soviet Union and India, Lukyanov noted that there had been 50 different contacts along the parliamentary line between India and the Soviet Union since 1955. Seven Indian parliamentary delegations visited the Soviet Union. In turn six Soviet delegations of the same kind visited India. We favour the continuation of deputy delegation exchanges, Lukyanov said. But in principle such delegations as a rule envisage only discussions of a wide range of questions. This is why we favour more active and fruitful contacts along the lines of Soviet and Indian parliamentary committees and commissions, including for international affairs, agrarian questions, youth problems, economic reform, culture and others. These contacts must form part of experience of the interparliamentary union. This is why we favour holding, within the frame work and with the participation of the interparliamentary union a number of joint events, including an interparliamentary conference on ensuring peace and security in the Asian-Pacific region. This proposal was appraised by our Indian friends as interesting and promising.

Finally, we face the task of developing interaction between the parliaments of Soviet republics and the legislative assemblies of Indian states and the bodies of local self-government, including along the line of twinned cities.

In short, the aims have been set, and work must be intensified along all lines, Lukyanov stressed in conclusion.

Discusses Aims, Results

PM0904103790 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 8 Apr 90 p 1

[Interview with A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, by "Our Own Correspondent" Yu. Lepskiy: "Three Seas Are No Barrier"; date of interview not specified; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Delhi—The chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet has completed his visit to India. Our correspondent in Delhi talks with A.I. Lukyanov.

[Lukyanov] The main aim is to increase our cooperation with India and continue and develop the elements laid down in our relations by M.S. Gorbachev's visit to India. We must not allow the impetus generated by that visit to slacken off. Unfortunately, we have of late observed this kind of slackening off. I repeat, this is inadmissible. It is not only a matter of our countries' traditional commitment to friendly ties. India is a great power—the largest in Southeast Asia. What is the Asia-Pacific region? It is the region of the future. It is the economy of the 21st century, which will grow very rapidly on a state-of-the-art scientific and technical base. Anyone who fails to realize this is not looking ahead. And anyone who is not looking ahead has no future. We are also an Asian country, and for that reason we are interested in this region. Hence the decision adopted by both the Presidential Council and the Supreme Soviet that the USSR Supreme Soviet chairman's first visit would be to India.

Now let me say a word about the results. We are satisfied with what we have succeeded in doing here. We had very fruitful, very frank meetings at the Indian Parliament. We also attended parliamentary sittings; moreover I discovered to my amazement a host of similarities with what goes on at our Supreme Soviet sittings. Some Indian deputies even reminded me of ours: Sobchak, for instance.... I had a thorough, 90-minute conversation with Indian Prime Minister V.P. Singh. We touched on three problems. First, we discussed the consolidation and development of our cooperation on the basis of the 1971 treaty. Second, we exchanged opinions on highly acute national problems which both India and our country have to resolve. For instance, we told our Indian friends unequivocally and firmly that the Kashmir question is India's internal affair and there should be no attempt to make it an international affair. We supported the Indian Government's firm and at the same time restrained and calm policy and its attempts to settle this highly acute question on a political basis and not by strongarm methods. Finally, the third thing that we discussed was specific ways of continuing and increasing our economic and scientific and technical cooperation. We proceeded on the premise that our countries have a closed currency system. We must find ways for the rupee and the ruble to interact.

I also had meetings with the country's Vice President S.D. Sharma and the current opposition leader Rajiv Gandhi, and had a number of important meetings in Bombay and Agra.... You know, throughout my time here I have forced my way through police cordons and guards to the ordinary people. I had several interesting discussions right on the streets.

[Lepskiy] There is the opinion—and it is easy to find in the Indian press—that, despite all its assurances, the USSR will lean toward the Western model and relations with the West in connection with economic restructuring and will slacken off its ties in the East....

[Lukyanov] I do know of such arguments. Our answer—and we gave it quite definitely and firmly here—is that we will develop and strengthen our relations with India. After all, assurances aside, there is also elementary logic. India is a good reliable partner of ours of long standing. We have long-standing ties that go back into the mists of time. Furthermore India and China represent half the population of the planet. We respect the Nonaligned Movement, of which India is the leader. It is a very modern movement in tune with the times. But here is almost the main argument. In our country good relations with India have assumed an interpeople [mezhdunarodnyy] character in the literal sense of the word. This means relations not only between our governments and officials but also contacts between people, families, and young people.

[Lepskiy] Can we be told the thoughts, ideas, and feelings which the Supreme Soviet chairman will take with him to the discussion of the youth program on Monday?

[Lukyanov] In many respects my thoughts, ideas, and feelings are linked with my personal experience. I began as a factory worker in 1943 and was at the same time a workshop Komsomol [All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League] organizer. Then I spent a long time in Komsomol work, including as deputy secretary of Moscow State University Komsomol Committee. That is why I have a special attitude to young people and the Komsomol. For instance, I believe that any succeeding generation is better than the previous generation, whatever old people may say. You simply have to be able to understand young people. I have already said that anyone who was not a radical in their youth was deprived of a childhood, while anyone who is not conservative in their old age is out of their mind. But if we are being serious, we will do everything possible to help solve the truly acute and pressing problems facing young people. I am referring to housing, the building [stanovleniye] of a young family, help for students, and so on. But on one condition alone: It is necessary to ensure that young people themselves participate in the people's common cause and work, so to speak, with their nose to the grindstone.

[Lepskiy] You spoke about the top-priority relations between our country and India and the special relations between our peoples. If that is the case, perhaps we should make the question of removing all manner of bureaucratic obstacles to relations between Soviet and Indian young people a priority. Should we not somehow simplify the procedure for our people to travel to India and vice versa. And our young people's involvement in international programs held there?

[Lukyanov] Of course, we can and must do this. Why are we always afraid of our own shadow? We must be bolder. I believe that these questions will also be discussed at the upcoming Komsomol congress. I would like to wish the congress constructive discussion and hope that it spends less time on procedural questions and more on the crux of the matter.

Lukyanov Interviewed on Visit

PM1004113990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Interview with A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, by own correspondent N. Paklin in Delhi: "Checking Watches in our Relations"; date of interview not stated; first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] The visit to India by A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, is coming to an end. Before leaving Delhi for a brief tour of the country, A.I. Lukyanov answered our correspondent's questions.

Delhi—[Paklin] Anatoliy Ivanovich, India has become the first country you have visited as chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Why did the choice fall on India? Is this connected with the change of government in that country?

[Lukyanov] The choice of India was by no means fortuitous. It is a great country, with which we maintain friendly relations. We intend to continue to develop and deepen them. But the main thing is to continue the line in our relations whose foundation was laid by M.S. Gorbachev's visit to India in November 1986. In brief, we had to check watches in our relations yet again. We succeeded in this. We believe that our trip has been successful, spearheaded toward deepening and developing Soviet-Indian ties.

[Paklin] I should like to know your personal opinion of the new Indian prime minister. Incidentally, if it is not a secret, what did you discuss at the talks?

[Lukyanov] He is a man who in my view is seeking a comprehensive approach toward problems, including problems of relations between our countries. We discussed questions of economic and scientific and technical cooperation and also the approaches of the Soviet Union and our attitude toward the conflict brewing in Northern India. I have in mind Kashmir. We unequivocally voiced our opinion which, as far as I understood it, was received sufficiently positively by the Indian side, to wit that the Kashmir problem is an internal matter for India and its internationalization is inadmissible. We also said that the Soviet Union supports India's desire to achieve the solution of the Kashmir problem on the paths of political dialogue and not by strong-arm methods.

[Paklin] What did you talk about with the Indian foreign minister?

[Lukyanov] Primarily about the consolidation of bilateral cooperation both in international affairs and in all spheres of relations between the Soviet Union and India: in politics, the economy, culture, interparliamentary, and scientific ties. There was a detailed discussion of our countries' approaches toward the problem of interregional conflicts and ways of resolving them. We dwelled in particular on the problems of the Asian and Pacific region. In particular we proposed holding an interparliamentary conference on the Asian and Pacific region in the near future. Our aim is to transform the region, which we believe has a great future, into a zone of peace, security, and good-neighborliness.

[Paklin] Your delegation's visit to Delhi began with a visit to the Indian parliament. You spent many hours inside its walls. What do you think of your experience of India's supreme legislative organ?

[Lukyanov] India is one of the biggest democracies in the world. There is no doubt that its parliamentary system was created on the English model but there is also no doubt that India has introduced a whole series of its own characteristic features to it. I believe we cannot ignore the experience of a single parliamentary system or leave its features unheeded. We must use in our own country the experience accumulated by others. That applies, naturally, to the experience of the Indian parliament as well. But here is what is indicative: In exchanges of opinions with the Indian parliamentarians—and they were prolonged—we found out that they too display unfeigned interest in our admittedly small but extremely curious experience and are ready to borrow something from it, in particular our experience of covering the work of parliament on radio and television, primarily in direct television broadcasts.

[Paklin] Consequently, links between the Soviet and Indian parliaments will be expanded?

[Lukyanov] Undoubtedly. Probably as early as this year a delegation from our parliament will visit India. A return visit to our country by Indian parliamentarians is scheduled for next year. But contacts will be deepened not only as a whole between parliamentarians, we will set up cooperation between the relevant parliamentary committees and commissions.

[Paklin] As far as I know you have visited India before. What are your impressions of this trip to India?

[Lukyanov] I last visited India about 10 years ago. This time I saw the country actively developing. So-called small business is developing particularly well and rapidly. I want to wish the Indian people and leadership a continued journey along this path.

Commentary on Saddam Husayn's 'Hostile' Remarks

NC1104114790 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Station commentary]

[Text] At a time when preparations are being made for the new round of Iran-Iraq peace talks in New York, Iraqi President Saddam Husayn issued his [word indistinct] and hostile statement. He said that his country has an effective chemical weapon, and only similar U.S. and Soviet weapons are stronger. According to Saddam Husayn, in case of an Israeli attack, Iraq's Armed Forces will set half of Israel on fire. He pointed out that during the final stage of the Iran-Iraq war, a modern binary chemical weapon was designed in Iraq but that this weapon was not used against Iran.

Our commentator writes: The Iraqi leader's threat was apparently against Israel. But the Iranians felt this threat more strongly, not only because Iran and Iraq are neighbors. Unfortunately the chemical weapon was used during the military operations on the Iran-Iraq fronts. Hundreds of military personnel and residents of Iran's border areas felt the impact of this horrible use. A larger number of people were killed after suffering terrible pain. This weapon was probably not [word indistinct], and the outcomes of its use—as horrific as they were—were not as well known as the results of binary chemical weapons.

But the question is: Why has the ghost of a chemical war appeared exactly when the representatives of Iran and Iraq are again preparing to sit at the negotiating table in order to find a final solution to the conflict? Tehran's ABRAR answered this question very clearly. The newspaper believes that the objective behind Iraq's threat is to affect the process of the peace talks. But how? Iran believes that Baghdad may possibly want to terrify the other side in the negotiations and to force it to retreat and to give in to Iraq's demands. These demands are that Iran should agree to review the contents of the [1975] Algiers agreement on the basis of which the border of the two countries is on the banks of the Shatt al-'Arab or Arvand Rud. Baghdad wants the two countries' borders to be set on the left bank of the river—that is, on the Iranian side of the river—and that the river be immediately cleaned of sunken ships and mud.

I do not think that Iran will accept these demands, despite any pressure and threats. Generally speaking, territorial conflicts cannot be solved through confrontation. Only through sincere steps toward peace and good-neighborliness can a logical decision that is acceptable by both sides be adopted. The two sides should look at their past and assess the bitter experience of the eight years of bloodshed which was marked by an era of a chemical war, an era of missile war, and an era of other savageries.

If today (?attention) were focused not on peace but only on the use of strength, then the ghost of a chemical war and of a nuclear holocaust will emerge. The time has come to end confrontations. I think that the new phase of the Iran-Iraq peace talks creates a good opportunity for this.

East Europe

Jaruzelski Outlines Expectations of USSR Visit

LD1104074690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0659 GMT 11 Apr 90

[Excerpt] Warsaw, 11 Apr (TASS)—Wojciech Jaruzelski, president of the Republic of Poland, left Warsaw this morning for an official visit to the Soviet Union. Before his departure, the head of state told journalists at Warsaw's Okecie Airport that during his stay in the USSR, he expects first and foremost confirmation of firm values resting at the foundation of Soviet-Polish relations. W. Jaruzelski expressed the hope that another step would also be made in an issue extremely important for the Polish people—namely making public the full truth about the "painful pages" in the shared history. [passage omitted]

Arrives in Lvov 11 Apr

LD1104092190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0858 GMT 11 Apr 90

[Text] Lvov, 11 Apr (TASS)—The itinerary of the official visit of Wojciech Jaruzelski, president of the Republic of Poland, to the Soviet Union began today with a meeting at Lvov airport. He has arrived in the USSR at the invitation of USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev. The state flags of Poland, the Soviet Union, and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic were raised in the guest's honor. The Polish leader was welcomed by representatives of the leadership of the republic oblast, and city.

Polish Daily Questions USSR Military Presence

PM0704125590 Warsaw POLITYKA in Polish 31 Mar 90 pp 1, 6

[Jan Dziadul article: "Ivan The Less Terrible: Tanks Beyond the Volga or On the Odra?"]

[Text] During the February disturbances in Swidnica, General Major Nikolai Domashev—deputy commander and chief of the Political Directorate of the Northern Group of Soviet Forces in Poland—came out to face the youthful demonstrators and, in response to their calls of "Tanks into the Volga!" and "Russkies out!," answered them calmly: "We will go or stay wherever our governments tell us to go or stay."

In the Soviet forces' headquarters the predominant belief is that the demonstrations in Swidnica, Legnica, and other cities in Western and Northern Poland are instigated by forces which are interested in creating a military "blank area" in these regions.

"Who

"Who? Whoever challenges your borders."

General V. Dubynin, who has been in Poland for less than a year and who before that commanded Soviet troops in Afghanistan, reiterates the old military adage that soldiers go where politicians send them. Though the subject of Afghanistan is avoided in conversations ("We fully support the decisions made by our authorities!"), you get the feeling that both the general and the sizeable group of officers who have been through the Afghan hell would like to receive their orders only from sensible politicians.

"We do not want to stay here irrespective of what happens!" declares the Soviet Army commander. "For officers and soldiers, service in their own country is, for many reasons, easier and more acceptable. If tomorrow we get the order to leave, we shall do so, though it is not a simple thing to carry out."

Swidnica's Mayor, Adam Markiewicz, does not share the opinion about "foreign instigation" during the affray. It was more like a senseless game played by schoolchildren, which escaped the original organizers' control. The mayor believes that uncertainty about the policies of the future united Germany has largely calmed the public mood. If at this moment a referendum were to be held in the city, he suggests, quite a number of residents would probably vote in favor of the Russians staying—though perhaps not in their present numbers (in Swidnica, with its population of 63,000, there are some 12,000 Soviet soldiers and civilians) and on different terms. It would be best if they gave back the flats, the leased buildings, the hospitals, and the schools in the city and moved out to "green site campuses" to make them less conspicuous.

The Black-and-White Game

We are divided in our opinions about the 55,000 soldiers and officers stationed in Poland—and they see this. V. Shutkevich wrote in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA (7 March) that their deep-rooted image as ideologically-inspired gendarmes, or even as an enemy occupying force, now conflicts on the banks of the Vistula and the Odra with the image of a protective umbrella which shields us from political bad weather. At the moment the contest to decide which of the two images will prevail is still under way....

In the cities where Soviet troops are stationed their image is two-sided: both black and white. The black side: It is they who, by taking up the available apartments, aggravate our housing problems (if they withdrew, housing difficulties in Legnica and Swidnica would be solved several times over.) It is they who devastate our roads and bridges, strip our stores bare of all goods, and offend our good taste with their slovenly appearance. They are simply Russians. The white side is appreciated by thousands of people who are employed to meet the requirements of the Soviet forces—by owners of service workshops, enterprises, farms, and stores who do excellent business with both troops and civilians. Simply with the Russians.

The black side of the image includes road accidents, devastated allotment plots, facilities built without official permission from the authorities (four in Swidnica), crimes and offenses perpetrated by soldiers, repeated instances of lawbreaking, and more....

On the white side again there is, for example, Colonel Vladimir Tovkach of the Legnica garrison hospital, ophthalmic surgeon, student of the celebrated Professor Fedorov, who has patients from all over Poland lining up to be seen by him. Last year he carried out nearly 1,600 complicated eye operations: In Moscow one such operation costs several hundred rubles. The white side of the image includes the Soviet hospitals which treat our patients in each garrison city and the Soviet troops' readiness to assist with construction projects or farm work.... However, this white aspect of their image was not much in evidence before. At best, we used to see shades of grey as proof of a positive attitude to our country.

How Much Do We Know About Them?

"How much do you know about us?" asks Lieutenant-Colonel Viktor Petrukhin reproachfully. Lt-Col. Petrukhin, an officer of the Political Directorate at the Group Headquarters, comes from Lvov and is a Slavonic studies graduate. "You describe us through jokes and hearsay, on the principle of, "I heard this woman say....", "Folks in town say...", or "My tailor tells me...." You base your picture of us on myths and legends.

"And whose fault is this?"

"Perhaps you are right.... Perhaps we had no chance...."

Mayor A. Markiewicz believes that perestroyka only reached the Soviet forces in Poland in the persons of V. Dubynin and N. Domashev. Last December the new commanders suggested a symbolic "roundtable meeting." This was set up in the troops' theatre hall. Gen. Dubynin briefed the audience in the tightly-packed auditorium on the conditions of the Soviet forces' stationing, their status, and their rights and duties. He also announced help with solving some shared municipal difficulties.... The local residents poured out their grievances: that the troops are an occupying force, because they are in a foreign country; that they are thieves, because soldiers stripped someone's garden of all the cherries.... The generals receive the brunt of all the resentments and grievances that have accumulated over the years.

"That was the first meeting of this kind in the history of their presence in our country," notes the mayor of Swidnica. "Previous commanders took no notice whatever of our administrative authorities, and did not care one bit about our problems in this city. We frequently heard the opinion expressed that they had won these territories, "captured" them, so they were practically at home here anyway. I do not need to explain to you the consequences of this kind of attitude. Not all the officers have gotten rid of this kind of thinking, but the men at the top display a new quality now. They behave like officers of a foreign Army which is temporarily stationed in a sovereign country.

Gen. N. Domashev, 55, is hurt by the comparison likening the forces under his command to an Army of foreign occupants. He lived through one foreign occupation in a small village not far from Kursk, so he knows what it is like. He finds it hard to swallow the bitter pill of Polish ingratitude.

"We liberated you, did we not? Our whole armies fell on this land; my father and several other members of my family fought in the war... Do you still remember the way in which real occupying forces behave? Do they pay their power, gas, water, or housing bills? Do they pay for damages incurred, down to the last kopeck? Do enemy occupants try to be as inconspicuous and as little trouble as possible? After all, we do not even give our national servicemen any leave passes; they are virtually confined to barracks for two years; we really do bend over backward...."

Over the year and a bit that he has spent in Poland, Gen. Domashev has already found out that we have very different views on our history and on what until recently used to be our common policy. We often fail to understand one another. Perestroyka is having a hard time of it in the USSR and it is only making its way with great difficulty in the Army.

"We are slaves of our past, our habitual ways of thinking, our education, our attitudes, and our beliefs.... Conservatism is deeply rooted in our nature. But I hope that we will eventually come to understand one another better."

Early this year an unofficial courtesy meeting was arranged between the Soviet command and prominent figures in the church hierarchy. For a variety of reasons, this first meeting has not yet been publicized.

An Army With No Secrets

In Gen. Domashev's office one whole wall is covered with detailed maps of the Soviet Union, Poland, and Europe. Above his chair hangs a portrait of M. Gorbachev; on the wall with the window, a portrait of D. Yazov, the defense minister. On the desk there are several telephones, including one with a direct line to Moscow. All you need to do is press a key.... I would guess that over the past few days it has been used a lot. Our interview had to be approved by Moscow. Until now, Polish journalists were not admitted to these offices.

"We obtained the authorization," announced Colonel Gennadiy Mikhailov, a staff officer, the night before, "since we are just as keen to show the truth as you are. We are surrounded by too many myths."

I can ask about anything to do with the stationing of the Soviet forces in Poland. I can go to any unit of my choice, watch the training routines, talk to soldiers of any nationality. Apart from strategic guidelines, the Soviet Army has no secrets. I choose Swietoszow: a tank regiment situated 120 km from Swidnica in a military complex, concealed in a forest, served by its own schools, hospitals, kindergartens, stores, and housing. "A complete military campus," as the Russians say.

The 55,000 Soviet troops in Poland (in Czechoslovakia, prior to the withdrawals, there were 75,000; in Hungary, 80,000) make up the immediate rear of the 350,000-strong Army stationed in the GDR. In what is still the GDR. Without the Northern Group the giant beyond the Odra would stand on feet of clay. But if, through some curious series of political coincidences—as one of the officers explains—Soviet troops were to withdraw from the GDR, then their division, of which the Swietoszow regiment is a part, would be the only real armored force in Southwestern Poland.

"This intelligence," he explains, contains no implications; it is just a statement of fact from a military viewpoint."

"So let us try to dispel some myths and legends," suggests Gen. Domashev.

Who Serves in Poland

The only criterion is the absence of a criminal record," he says. "You have plenty of your own hooligans without us bringing in ours as well. National servicemen are flown into Poland for two years or 18 months, provided that they have been sworn in and attained a specialization. When they board the plane they generally have no idea whether they will land in Arkhangelsk, Kamchatka, Berlin, or near Legnica."

Professional servicemen can remain in one country for up to five years (for those who know Polish, the tour of duty can be extended on exceptional grounds) before they return to the USSR. After another five years they have the opportunity of being moved to, say, the GDR, and that is the end of it. You cannot serve in more than two countries. Civilian contract employees (for example, teachers, doctors, or nurses) sign three-year contracts with an optional one-year extension.

"The rumors that we pass in turn through every European country where our troops are stationed and only return home when it is time to start collecting our pensions, are fairy tales."

The General denies that connections allegedly open doors to the lucrative service abroad. He himself began in Ulyanovsk, was next moved to near Moscow, and then to Chukotka; he subsequently served in Leningrad, Arkhangelsk, in the Baltic republics, and Odessa (where he stayed long enough to get an apartment of his own); he was in the GDR for just under one year, was then recalled to Moscow, and now he is here, in Poland. There are no guarantees that he will serve the full five years here.

A younger officer (six months in Poland) does not share the General's view. Connections are used and strings pulled all too often: Professional servicemen find that it is still worth their while (to a different degree, depending on the country) to be stationed abroad. The unofficial waiting list of those eager to go is quite long.

Lieutenant Zbignev Oleg from Donetsk (our guardian on the way to Swietoszow) knew that he would be going to Poland. At officer training college he studied the language and was trained for service in our country. Lt-Col. Igor Khromov from the Swietoszow unit, graduate of the Military Political Academy, also had no reason to fear the prospect of life in a garrison on the Chukotka Peninsula.

Is It Worth It?

The professional servicemen, from general to warrant officer, get their salary in rubles, paid into their savings accounts in the USSR (Gen. Domashev receives R600 a month; Col. Mikhailov—R400; Major Petr Kireyev, deputy commander of a tank regiment—R350; Lieutenant Oleg—R230), whereas in Poland they receive equivalent amounts in zlotys. The rate of exchange at the beginning of March was Z1400 to R1. National servicemen get from Z15,000 (rifleman) to Z32,000 (sergeant, tank commander, equivalent to our senior corporal) of army pay. Wives who go out to work are paid only in zlotys. The unofficial trade which flourishes in garrison towns often multiplies these amounts.

Professional servicemen receive army ration allocations of meat, butter, sugar, groats, bread, fish, and potatoes. They enhance and vary their diet with purchases made in either Polish or their own stores, for zlotys, at prices no different from those in our own retail outlets. They can purchase food allowances for their families, paid for in rubles at USSR prices. On the international ranking list (which is the best country to serve in?) the first two places go to Hungary and the GDR. They are the least expensive. In Poland things were not too bad when Soviet prices were converted directly into zlotys. But the disparities grew so large that it became impossible to control profiteering. Consequently, Soviet prices were adjusted to correspond to Polish prices.

Bills To Pay

The general cannot disclose the total costs of the stationing of the Soviet forces in Poland: This is still classified information. But he offers us examples. Last year the Northern Group paid R1.8 million in water and sewage disposal bills (the exchange rate is the same as for the Transfer Ruble); R5.5 million in power bills; R8.65 million for coal; R0.65 million in gas bills, and R4.5 million for leasing rent on 3,611 buildings, including 1,157 residential quarters. Professional servicemen pay rent (at the municipal rates) and their bills for gas, power, and telephones, though the latter are official service lines.

In January and February of this year, Swidnica's budget received from the "Soviet Quarter" Z5 million for refuse disposal; Z90 million for water services; Z45 million for electricity; and Z2 million for gas. In the past there were problems with receiving these payments on time, but today the mayor has no complaints. However, this does not mean that everything is absolutely fine. The leasing rents are paid into the central budget, as are other charges, while those directly concerned receive only small amounts.

In 1985 Swidnica was visited by the deputy premier, accompanied by several ministers and generals, the city's Mayor recalls, and the surprised local authorities were informed that they would have the honor of hosting the command of the Northern Group of Soviet Forces, which was moving out of Legnica. Previously, we had only four small units here. The deputy premier promised us Z1 billion from the budget for development of the city's infrastructure. By 1988 we received a little over Z500 million. Last year the Finance Minister stopped the money: The Russians will have to take part, financially and in terms of materials, in the development of the infrastructure which they use on an equal footing with us.

The bill presented to the Soviet Army for last year's expenditure in Swidnica alone came to Z890 million (at 1989 prices). The major items included the construction of a sewage treatment plant, a water intake construction, and the installation of a heating distribution network. The bill has been sent off, but to date nothing has been heard about it. The Soviet Army does not refuse to pay, but explains that there is no money in the coffers to cover this kind of expenditure. Matters of this kind should be regulated by intergovernmental agreements, just like the question of supplies.

Soviet troops are supplied with meat and basic produce through the services of the "Marco" enterprise, set up expressly for this purpose. Accounts are settled at the level of foreign trade ministries. Consequently, supplies to military units do not impinge on allocations for individual voivodships. Mayor Markiewicz admits that until recently the retail distribution network of garrison towns received additional preferential supplies: This system was supposed to protect our stores against Soviet pressure. Now things are more straightforward: The shelves are full and they can buy as much as they want. You no longer hear complaints that there is no sausage in the stores because the Russkies bought it all up.

The 1956 treaty regulating the legal status of the Soviet forces temporarily stationed in Poland (see S. Podemski, POLITYKA 7) was two years later augmented by an executory agreement regulating the terms of the stationing, including questions of supplies and the mutual settlement of accounts. Now these documents have reached their last days. The new agreements will presumably regulate the questions of charges for the lease of the 60,000 hectares of training grounds, forests, airfields, and... hunting grounds on different terms. Until now the Russians have not paid even the symbolic zloty for these, taking advantage of the privileges of the Polish Armed Forces. However, as Podemski rightly pointed out, we are on our home ground here....

PRAVDA in Windows

The new agreements should resolve what today seems to be the most sensitive issue, that of repairs to the residential and other buildings occupied by military and civilian personnel. We have complained for a long time about the appearance of the buildings, windows, and staircases, and objected to the devastation of our property. The repertory of symbols of the Soviet forces' presence in Poland includes the image of windows in which sheets of PRAVDA are used for curtains....

"According to the terms of the agreement, the Polish side is obliged to carry out repairs to the outside of properties, but you do not do this, claiming resource shortages," insists General Domashev. "After all, we do pay our rents; despite this, we still pay for the repairs ourselves, but we are not able to maintain everything in order."

"They should do the repairs themselves, since this is a leasing rather than renting agreement," counters the mayor of Swidnica. "They pay only 50 percent of the going rate precisely so that they could use the rest of the money for the necessary repairs."

Swidnica's "Soviet Quarter" looks neat enough, the Mayor stresses. Before the headquarters arrived here, things looked really terrible, almost as bad as in Legnica: Devastated properties used by the Army were an eyesore. All this changed with the arrival of the military elite in Swidnica.

Gen. Domashev is clearly annoyed when the case of Legnica is brought up in our conversation. If I wish, he would show me all his restricted areas, so that I can compare them with the Polish part of the city. I saw two such areas: Well, they looked like all Army compounds do. Residential housing, even in civilian districts, does not differ from accepted standards. Lt Col Igor Khromov shows me round the civilian-military compound in Swietoszow. The facades of the buildings look gloomy, but are well-maintained, and there are no newspapers for curtains. The grounds of the all units are no different than in any other Army unit: If necessary, they paint the grass green.

All the same, Legnica remains a festering sore. Col Gennadiy Mikhailov says that there are all sorts of people, just as anywhere else. We point our fingers at them and criticize them, but they are also surprised by many things they see. They travel through Lower Silesian villages and cannot understand how anyone could let such good properties and farm buildings fall into ruin. How can people live in such conditions?

The next day I am taken round Legnica's "Soviet Quarter." Things are fifty-fifty: Neat and decent areas lie side by side with places squalid beyond description. I then go round Legnica's Polish part, visit buildings along Chojnowska Street, staircases, back yards. If not for the Polish names on the lists of residents, you could simply have said: This is where the Russians live. In this case, do we have the right to say: But we are here on our own, home ground!?

Fear of Going Back

In a February edition of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, Chief of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, noted bitterly, as he wrote about the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary and Czechoslovakia (and he did not rule out the possibility of the same thing happening to the troops in Poland and the GDR), that the country was not prepared for the return of commissioned and warrant officers. "We will withdraw the troops, but no one has seriously thought of what this will involve. We shall feel our social problems even more acutely; officers and their families will find themselves in a situation akin to that of refugees. They will be without housing, without jobs, and their children will be without schools...."

These fears are also shared by servicemen stationed in Poland, though Gen. Domashev maintains that their concern is not as grave as that of their colleagues from the Southern Group of Forces. In the Soviet Armed Forces some 50 percent of career officers and men have no housing of their own. In the course of their professional life they are often transferred from one garrison and one service accommodation to another, thousands of kilometers to the east or west. Only those who manage to stay longer in one particular place are able to get an apartment. Until now they used to be allowed to stay longer in a garrison only for a period prior to being pensioned off, so that they could find a roof over their heads. The sudden withdrawal of troops from Hungary and Czechoslovakia revealed the weaknesses of what is already a fragile system. If this were to be connected with troop reductions, thousands of officers would be left homeless with few chances to find any housing within civilian systems.

"We could sleep in tents," declares Maj. Petr Kireyev from the Swietoszow unit, "but what about our wives and children, what about our families? There will be 20,000 children leaving alongside the troops when they withdraw from Czechoslovakia. Will there be places for them in kindergartens, in schools?"

"A special section, exclusively handling housing construction for the families of servicemen returning home, has been set up at the Defense Ministry," says Gen Domashev. "It seems to me, although I would not like to prejudge the issue, that for the time being the Northern and Western (GDR) Groups will, at least in part, remain in their garrisons, at least until such time as we can sort out the housing for the returning men."

A Soldier's Condition

Over the last year, and during the first two months of this year, nearly 10,000 troops were withdrawn from the Northern Group and returned to the USSR. These included helicopter and tank regiments and a construction battalion. Some of their barracks were taken over by the Polish Army. Properties built before 1945 are being returned to their owner, the treasury, free of charge. Post-war properties (in Swidnica, for example, over the past few years the Russians built 1,000 apartments) are being sold to towns and parishes. In Legnica, a theatre and several dozen buildings have been handed over already. Now the inhabitants demand that the commandant's offices be handed over for the prosecutor's offices! The Soviet command objects: The adoption of a new building for the requirements of Army command would cost hundreds of thousands of rubles, whereas their Army is beginning to count every kopeck before it spends it.

On 7 March the soldiers of the Swietoszow tank regiment had the following dishes served for lunch: chicken broth (as much as they wanted), pork chops for the main course, and stewed fruit. They said it was a typical menu, no special extras to impress visitors. They are all fed generously, often better than back home in their own country. They listed the daily rations: Each day a soldier must receive half a loaf of rye bread and half a loaf of wheat bread; almost 200 grams of meat; half that amount of fish; two eggs; 500 grams of potatoes; fruit; vegetables...all in all 26 items. Each soldier gets 18 packets of cigarettes per month (these can be exchanged for sweets) and miserable army pay—which most of them save up for presents for their nearest and dearest.

In a training room they organized for us a meeting with 20 servicemen, certainly preselected, but Lt Col Igor Khromov assures us that this means nothing. Our men are more talkative, and they have a reasonably good command of Russian (it transpires that this is a major problem in the Soviet Army). They found out that they were going to Poland when they were already aboard the plane. We suggest that this was, presumably, not good news...?

"A soldier must serve wherever his homeland sends him!" volunteers Sergeant Konstantin Udovkin, a Belorussian, conscripted from Estonia, where he went to school.

But no one else supports him in this protestation and this belief. Life would have been easier in any corner of the USSR. Here they get no leave passes; parcels are rare; family visits out of the question; as to girlfriends, thay can only dream about them.... Instead, you are obliged to maintain higher combat readiness.

Same in Letters

They do not know Poland and have no chance to get to know even their immediate surroundings. All contacts are official, at commander levels, and rank-and-file soldiers can only meet their counterparts during exercises or on brief visits, made on national and state holidays, to theoretically friendly "twinned" units. Even then there is no time for anything except the "most important" item on the agenda: the group photograph—in which everyone should be happy, beaming, and, ideally, brandish a copy of the unit newsletter in his hand—and then it is back to the barracks. "Just a propaganda piece for the unit notice board," they dismiss these manifestations of friendship disdainfully. They would like to see Warsaw, Krakow, Wroclaw, the cities which, their officers assure them, they are protecting. Perhaps they will never get an opportunity to do this....

Sejm Privatization, Police Debates Reported

PM1004140590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
10 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by L. Toporkov: "Poland: Stormy Debates in Sejm"]

[Text] Warsaw—The draft laws on the privatization of the national economy and on the transformation of the militia into the police and the abolition of the security service have given rise to stormy debates at sessions of the Polish Sejm.

Deputy R. Bartoszcze, representing the Citizens' Parliamentary Club, stated that the Ministry of Internal Affairs and PZPR [Polish United Workers Party] archives have been destroyed to cover up the traces of the close ties maintained with the authorities by some "Solidarity" figures who, he said, were informers for the security service. Professor B. Geremek, chairman of the Citizens' Parliamentary Club, immediately took the floor. He called the statement by his deputies' club colleague slander and in this connection has sent a letter to the prime minister asking the government to take the necessary measures against the unfounded accusations.

As a result of this scandal in the "Solidarity" clan, the "police drafts" have receded into the background, as it were. Yet they are of considerable interest inasmuch as the citizens' militia is turning itself into the state police, resurrecting the traditions of prewar Poland. Its workers, according to the drafts, will not be members of parties and if they are at present they must leave the parties. Instead of the security service a state protection service is being introduced, retaining military titles. The Ministry of Internal Affairs becomes a strictly civilian department and the main administrative organ. It will supervise the policy of institutions like the police, the state protection service, the fire service, and the border guards.

After a speech by Internal Affairs Minister C. Kiszczak in which he asked for forgiveness for his department's errors in the past, the new laws on the police were adopted.

One more question attracted the attention both of the Sejm deputies and the broad public in Poland—the question of the existence of the 22 July holiday, Polish rebirth day, connected with the well known manifesto of the Polish national liberation committee. The holiday which to this day has been traditionally celebrated as the holiday of the birth of the people's Poland and the country's liberation from the fascist invaders, rendered possible thanks to the Soviet Union and Polish-Soviet brotherhood in arms. Polish President W. Jaruzelski, knowing of the Sejm deputies' intention to renounce the holiday, addressed a lengthy letter to the Sejm marshal asking for the question to be treated attentively.

But by a majority of votes the deputies rejected the request of the republic's president and expressed themselves in favor of removing 22 July from the Polish calendar. They voted for the resurrection of a holiday in honor of the 18th century Polish constitution.

Romania's Salvation Front Appeals to Nation

LD0804193190 Moscow TASS in English 1819 GMT 8 Apr 90

[Text] Bucharest April 8 TASS—The National Salvation Front (NSF) of Romania, created by the revolution, is a political movement of broad social layers of the population aiming to profoundly Renew Romanian society, says the NSF appeal to the nation released here today.

The Front intends to create a pluralistic, democratic political system, a modern efficient economy and to revive national culture. The complete and final rupture with the communist system and its ideology is the main condition for accomplishing these tasks, the document stresses.

The NSF concept and its political actions are based on human rights and the common interests of all Romanian citizens. The front is a left-centrist movement gravitating towards traditional values and aims of European social democracy.

The guidelines for the activity aimed at creating a prosperous Romania open to the future are outlined in the NSF programme of democratization of the state and political life, including pluralism of political choice of opinions and convictions, the creation of political parties and free trade unions, the broad guarantees and full protection of the basic human rights and freedoms, including those of ethnic minorities.

In the economic field, the NSF proposes the transition from the centralised system of planning to a decentralized system, based on the market-oriented economy, the expansion of the private sector, the preservation of the state ownership of enterprises in the fields of national importance, the encouragement of foreign investment while ensuring the protection of the national market, the revival of individual farming, the support for associations and farming cooperatives and the liquidation of state foreign trade monopoly.

The appeal outlines broad measures in the social field, including better supplies of foodstuffs, consumer goods, electric power, fuel and heating to the population, the increase of housing building, the introduction of a 40-hour working week, the protection against unemployment, the ban of arduous work for women, the support for new families. Plans are made for reorganization education at all levels.

The National Salvation Front called on all Romanian citizens to take a constructive part in building a society based on the ideals and values of the December revolution in Romania.

Romania's Iliescu Fields Border Issue Question

PM1104092790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Apr 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "National Salvation Front's Position"]

[Text] Bucharest, 9 Apr—The National Salvation Front [NSF] can be described as a center-left political movement drawn toward the traditional ideas of European social democracy. This was stated at a press conference by I. Iliescu, chairman of the NSF's leadership collegium and chairman of the Provisional Council for National Accord. We have already taken certain steps to engage in dialogue with a number of West European social democratic parties.

With regard to a possible coalition between the Front and other Romanian parties, I. Iliescu noted that the NSF is open to alliances with the country's political parties which have positions close to the Front. However, such a coalition would only be possible after the elections and with the formation of a new government. This does not rule out the possibility of including independent candidates on the NSF electoral rolls.

With regard to the problem of denationalizing the economy, Romanian Prime Minister P. Roman stressed that such fundamental transformations cannot be implemented by the present government, which is an interim government. However, even the current government has an economic platform, in accordance with which it is taking definite steps in this direction.

Answering a question about planned measures to protect the population's budget from possible negative consequences as a result of the planned transition to a market economy, I. Iliescu said that the decision to switch to a market economy reflects the approach of the country's current leadership to reality. Market relations today define the position in both the world and the national economy.

I. Iliescu was asked about the negative consequences for the state of the scrapping of Romania's former security service—the "Securitate." Indeed, Romania—like any state—needs such a service to protect its interests, particularly now that various networks of agents have become active in the country. To that end, a Romanian information service was recently set up which will differ radically from the "Securitate." Its functions will include counterintelligence rather than the persecution of its own citizens.

Regarding the Front's position on the so-called "Bessarabian question," the NSF leader stated that it would not be sensible to raise the border problem at this time.

Romanian Opposition Launches Election Campaign

PM0604140590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Volodin dispatch: "Coalition Starts the Struggle"]

[Text] Bucharest—There has been an announcement in Bucharest on the creation of a political electoral coalition of three historical parties—the National Peasant Party, the National Liberal Party, and the Social Democratic Party. As its first step the union created will reject any kind of cooperation with the National Salvation Front, which the opposition forces identify with the communist party which has disappeared from the political arena.

It must be noted that the difference in the program documents of the three historical parties only consists of a few nuances. There is the same orientation toward France, the declaration of the primacy of Western-style democracy, the encouragement of private initiative in industry and agriculture. However, it seems that it was not just the coincidence of party programs that served as the basis for the formation of the "triple" union.

The statements made by representatives of all the historical parties, which insist that people who held leading posts during the previous regime today do not possess the moral right to political activity, are very characteristic. You do not have to examine all the details of the power struggle which is taking place at the moment in Romania in order to understand that the barbs of such statements are directed against the National Salvation Front and primarily against I. Iliescu. Opposition forces have frequently tried to put to the test both the strength of the National Salvation Front and its leader.

It cannot be said that these demonstrations have involved a striking number of people. Possibly one of the largest of these was the one held last Sunday, in which approximately 2,000 people participated. However, their regularity makes you think that in stepping up the election campaign, the opposition coalition will pass up the chance to make active use of the thesis that the National Salvation Front and the RCP [Romanian Communist Party] can be equated, meaning that a man who received his higher education in the Soviet Union cannot be trusted with the reins of power. Incidentally, counting on anti-Sovietism and playing on the Romanians' national feelings is by no means the last resort in the hunt for future votes, which could become a dangerous "witch-hunt," in I. Iliescu's opinion. Particularly if you bear in mind the fact that until recently in Romania there were almost 4 million members in the RCP and if you take into account the members of the former Union of Communist Youth and other social organizations, then the number of people connected with the RCP in one way or another makes up almost half of the country's population.

It must be noted that the worries expressed by the leader of the National Salvation Front on this subject are not entirely unfounded. I have often happened to witness the fact that during anti-National Salvation Front demonstrations, anyone who tried to defend a different point of view was accused of belonging to the former party nomenklatura or to the "Securitate." I believe that the desire to rush to label political opponents can be explained not just by the actions of large pressure groups, whose noisy presence can be perceived at every demonstration, but also by the lack of experience in running an election campaign. Even the National Salvation Front itself makes mistakes in the election campaign and is gradually losing its prestige and the trust of certain strata of the population.

Romania's Petre Comments on Ceaucescu Legacy

PM1004155690 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 14, 8 apr 90 p 7

[Undated interview with Romanian Prime Minister Roman Petre by Vitaliy Tretyakov: "Romania's Prime Minister Dreams of a Market Economy, Certain That It Will Make His Country Flourish"]

[Text] Bucharest—Q.: Mr. Roman, what did you think about on the first night after becoming Prime Minister?

A.: This really happened at night. I thought that I had found myself in a very grave predicament because the

Romanian economy, primarily all of its industrial sectors, was in dire straits. During the last years of the Ceausescu dictatorship, the management of Romania's economy was totally illogical.

Q.: Any, even the most important person, has to sooner or later leave his post. What would you like to do in order to later leave your post with a clear conscience?

A.: I would like to do my job honestly. Upon my appointment I had to study everyone very well and secure accord with everyone in the Council of Ministers, and then secure the approval of our programmes by society and the population. This has become possible. I think that now I understand very well what the working people's conditions were like under Ceausescu. It has proved to be even worse than I expected. Now we have given vent to our main resources—human resources, primarily the intellect of our specialists who were introduced into the government. This has enabled all of us to provide more real and rational conditions for our economy to become operable. Because the first problem was to keep a viable production apparatus intact. Following this, we started thinking about the direction of our advance. What should be done to get rid of centralism and rigid planning, from that communist structure of the economy which, I believe, had great appeal to Stalin. The transition from this structure is very difficult. The question is one of decentralizing economic management and ensuring much greater independence of the enterprises with a view of preparing them for work in conditions of the market. For me it is self-evident that a healthy economy cannot be built without competitiveness, that is, a healthy economy is a market economy.

On the other hand, in forming the government, we believed as we still believe now, that the public sector is absolutely indispensable, especially in the social and industrial infrastructure, education, public health, social security, the power industry and transport. But even the public sector must function in the interests of the population, not the bureaucracy.

Recently we set up a government commission led by Academician Postolache, which is studying the problems of going over to a market economy. And when the first elements of this market orientation become operable, I shall be able to say that I am satisfied, that we have really managed to accomplish what we conceived.

Q.: Evidently these elements won't begin to function all at once...

A.: Some are beginning to operate even now.

Q.: But not so quickly for you to be able to quietly leave your post?

A.: Of course, not....

Q.: Romania will soon have to have elections which, if I am not mistaken, may bring about if not a change in the whole government, then a replacement of some of the cabinet members. What is your view of this perspective?

A.: I don't think that as a result of the elections we shall arrive at an absolutely different situation than now. Broad understanding and consent already exist in society about the objectives of economic development, which is why it is not so very important who personally will be the prime minister or members of the government.

Q.: One of the main reproaches levelled at Stalinism is that the economic systems in different socialist countries looked absolutely alike. Now the impression is that all the East European countries are again heading towards the same model. How will Romania find its own way in this single stream?

A.: The renunciation of Stalinist-type communism does not necessarily imply adopting some particular Western model. As I have said, our orientation is towards a liberalization of the economy, but with a greater specific share of the public sector. Every country in Eastern and central Europe will still travel along its specific road even if the ways by which they arrived at a democratic society were also very different. In Romania there was a revolution, i.e., a popular explosion, which overturned and finally rejected the entire system of Stalinist communism. In other countries this transition was effected by reliance upon the old structures, even upon old Party structures. In Romania this was impossible. We had to invent everything from the very beginning, and we adopted the path of respecting different points of view, even those which were diametrically opposite ours. And all points of view are being considered in the democratic process. This is what will determine the specifics of our road.

Q.: Recently one journalist called you a prime minister of a government of technocrats. Do you reject this definition?

A.: No, I do not. From the very beginning I said that in the conditions we had inherited the only chance for us was to form a government of specialists. The word "technocrat" has some negative meaning, which is why I would prefer the definition "specialist". We needed very competent people who are well-versed in different sectors of the economy. In forming the government I didn't ask any of the ministers what their political orientation was. Nor am I doing this now.

Q.: You hardly have the time now to follow the debates in the Soviet parliament, have you?

A.: Before the revolution I watched my TV set each night because here, in Bucharest, we could receive the first Moscow programme via Bulgaria. And this was very important for us. But since our revolution, I no longer do this—there's no time.

Q.: Then I want to tell you that our government often complains that criticism from MPs interferes with its work. And what kind of relationship do you have with those who criticize the government?

A.: Our difficulties do not stem from this side, but from the side of the working people who come to present their demands, often threatening with strikes. I have always believed that we are duty bound to return to the working people those rights that the dictator took away from them. But on the whole the economy does not permit us now to reconsider wages. Therefore it took us a long time to negotiate each issue and, fortunately, we met with understanding in the long run.

Q.: One French scientist, who generally takes exception to communist ideology, recently told me: and still it's a pity that communism is leaving—disappearing together with it is some seam of 20th-century human culture. I would like to know your attitude towards outgoing communism.

A.: Indeed, it's sad. I'm upset by this because my father was a fighter for the ideals of communism. He fought in the International Brigades in Spain, he took part in the defence of Moscow when the Germans came close to your capital in the Volokolamsk line of advance, and was even awarded the Defence of Moscow Medal. Later, when the personality cult was exposed, he was arrested and our family's condition was tragic. And then I came to understand that those horrible phenomena, which later came to be associated with Stalin's name, were a consequence of the system, not a mere fortuity of deformation of history. Regrettably, the system itself generated phenomena like the Ceausescu dictatorship. Therefore the communist system is indefensible. It has not been able to achieve anything either in the economy, because centralized planning spelled misery at best, or on the social plane, in public health, anywhere. And, first and foremost, nothing positive has been created on the plane for person-to-person relations. Yet communism was born as an attempt to establish different human relations, but it led to their deterioration in comparison with what has existed before.

Q.: What Romanian or foreign newspapers and magazine do you read?

A.: None, because I have no time now. I read them only when I'm told that I must look at something or read something.

Q.: That is, here you depend on your aides, don't you?

A.: Yes, of course.

Q.: But how then can you maintain objectivity in understanding the situation in the country?

A.: I get much information from my ministers or public figures who come to tell me what they think about our situation. One of the strongest positions which were laid down when forming the government was our desire to eliminate lies from all our activities.

Q.: How much do you get paid now as the prime minister, and how does your salary relate to the average level of wages in the country?

A.: The prime minister's salary is 12,000 lei. This is roughly 250 per cent higher than the average wages in the country. But this is much less than what used to be before. Besides, we have eliminated various increments and privileges.

Q.: And where do you live? In a state-owned flat or where you used to live before?

A.: I can't live where I lived before because my flat was in close proximity with Palace Square where there was plenty of shooting—they even fired on the house where I lived. And I had to move elsewhere. I've moved into a flat with the same floor space—three rooms—where I now live with my wife and two children.

Q.: I attended Mr. Ion Iliescu's press conference—journalists were seriously checked there before entering. Iliescu even said that this was necessary since there was information about likely attempts at physical violence. Do you feel any threat for yourself?

A.: I don't feel any such threat. Indeed, there were various kinds of information, including that about possible attempts at physical violence, but personally I'm not afraid of anything.

Q.: What kind of car transports you around the city? Has it been specially equipped for the eventuality of an attack?

A.: No, it's an ordinary Dacia automobile.

Q.: And my last question: if everything proceeds more or less normally, when do you, as the prime minister, think you will be able to come closer to the standard of living existing in the West?

A.: This will call for a long time. But if we bear in mind the standard of living comparable to that in the West, the research studies we have carried out in defining the guideposts for the transition period make it possible to hope that in two or three years we shall effect a transition towards a market economy, and that it will take us roughly another five years to modernize our industry. And then, I believe, the standard of living will be acceptable in Romania.

Article Deplores Revival of Romanian Fascists

PM1004104390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 7 Apr 90 p 3

[TASS correspondent for KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA dispatch: "A Rusty Old Guard Reawakening"]

[Text] Bucharest—"Is the 'Iron Guard' reawakening?" is a question that many people in Romania are asking themselves today. Where could such fears have appeared from, and is the rebirth of this fascist, terrorist organization, which had seemingly disappeared for ever, real? It all began about 2 months ago, when the newspaper DESTEPTAREA, published in Bacau Judet, received a letter in which the armed, anticommunist organization "The Iron Guard-Legion of the Archangel Michael" announced its rebirth. "We will not stop until we destroy all communists, socialists, and other left-wing rabble," the letter said. "Our time has come at last! The country will be ours once again!"

Later, commenting on the extremist attacks carried out by some demonstrators who burst into the government residence on Victory Square 18 February, Ion Iliescu, chairman of the Interim Council of National Conciliation, expressed the belief that their actions could have been organized and directed by surviving members of the legion organization. This rather cautious utterance by the Romanian leader caused a storm of indignation in the "independent" press. Thus, a rejoinder published in EXPRES said that legionnaires' fabricated threat was being deliberately tossed at Romanian society in order to divert attention from important problems and to justify "firm hand" measures and intimidate the population.

What is the "Iron Guard?" Formed in bourgeois-landowning Romania in 1930 amid an economic crisis, this organization became a resolute opponent of democracy, declaring as its enemies "politicians, communists, and Jews." Advocating ardent nationalism and mystic religious beliefs and making extensive use of terrorist methods, the "Iron Guard" were even prepared to unleash civil war in their bid for power. Their unbridled extremism forced King Carol II to outlaw the "Iron Guard." It managed to achieve "legal" status in 1940 and, in a desperate attempt to seize power, its members staged an insurrection; this was put down by I. Antonescu, who then became Romanian dictator. The majority of the defeated legionnaires emigrated to Germany to be "under the wing" of Hitler, who had financed the "Iron Guard" and protected it in every way. Even today, many of the aged legionnaires are living out their days in foreign lands. One of them, for example, is Horia Sima, a former fellow-fighter of Otto Scorceni, who lives in Spain and writes "program" articles in the emigre press, including articles on the events currently taking place in Romania.

...Since the December revolution Romania has opened its borders, crossing off the lists of "undesirables" all the people who had the rated from the country during the period of the dictatorship either legally or by simply not returning from business trips. A torrent of emigres flooded into Romania—some have become involved in political activity, intending to participate in the elections due 20 May, others have put forward plans to create joint enterprises, while others have displayed a commendable desire to provide unselfish assistance to their country. But by no means everyone who has come to Romania has been inspired exclusively by the noble desire to give assistance to their fatherland now that it has thrown off the yoke of dictatorship. Thus, ROMPRES recently broadcast the text of an order by Romanian Interior Minister M. Chitac under which three Canadians of Romanian origin—N.D. Popescu, G. Belas, and M. Moisin—were given 48 hours to leave the country. It is known that N.D. Popescu, speaking at a rally in Kluj, stated that he had once tried to shoot Ceausescu, but... had missed. It seems that he is wanted by the Canadian police for precisely that reason. But then again, the Bucharest LIBERATIA published a photograph of the luckless sniper in which he is pictured next to H. Sima during a legionnaires' ritual in 1987....

Some people prefer to brush these facts aside and not take seriously the possibility of the fascist organization's revival; other are reflecting on the reasons for the reanimation of dark forces which would seem hateful to all normal people; while yet others heatedly assert that communism did the country more damage than the "Iron Guard."

Be that as it may: If we are to analyze—even purely theoretically—the possible existence of imitators of the odious "Iron Guard" in Romania today, there are a whole series of factors that must not be overlooked. First of all, it is only 50 years since the legionnaires' defeat in 1940, so that there are almost definitely people living in the country now who know what the "Iron Guard" is, and not just by hearsay. It is worth noting a press report on the fact that in 1945-1946 a pact was concluded between the Romanian Communist Party [RCP] and the then underground legionnaires, as a result of which many former "Iron Guard" members became RCP members. This fact has not yet been verified by documentation, but it cannot be ruled out, since the dictator Ceausescu, it is affirmed, had a soft spot for the "Iron Guard." In particular, in his numerous speeches he liked to quote the official legionnaire poets R. Gira and I. Militaru. Many features of the totalitarian regime that he built in Romania surprisingly and suspiciously recall the legionnaire concept of the "corporative state." The fact that legionnaire attitudes are very widespread among the Romanian diaspora—the structure of the organization is preserved, specific rituals are still performed, and legionnaire publications exist—is a further cautionary factor.

It must also be noted that the conditions of political pluralism in Romania (where the "Iron Guard" is showing signs of life, but not a trace is left of the Communist Party!) are favorable for the growth of not only "flowers" but also "weeds."

Of course, all this is no more than "food for thought," furnished by certain aspects of political life in Romania today. Although there is still time for reflection, it does seem to be running out: DESTEPTAREA recently received another letter. The envelope contained a picture, cut out of a foreign magazine, of Hitler.

Romanian Land Legislation Controversy Viewed

*PM0604091390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
5 Apr 90 Second Edition p5*

[Own correspondent V. Vedrashko report: "People Getting Emotional Over Land"]

[Text] Bucharest—The early dry spring in Romania is providing considerable grounds for concern. The absence of a clear agrarian policy has turned many villages into seething cauldrons. The disputes over land are fraught with conflicts breaking out between peasants.

Some people are demanding that the cooperatives be dissolved and the old forms of land management restored. These are mainly people living in villages and earning money at urban industrial enterprises, pensioners receiving a state pension, and some young people. Meanwhile, another segment of the peasantry is feeling the threat of deteriorating living conditions. They are elderly people receiving a pension from a cooperative: albeit only a small one but guaranteed nevertheless. This group also includes peasants belonging to cooperatives who are drawing close to pensionable age and who, having worked many years in agriculture, now risk being left without any provision in their old age. At the same time, there are people who, prior to collectivization, had only small allotments or nothing at all and who could now find themselves in the position of day laborers working the land of a neighbor who will have more land than he can manage with his family alone.

The immediate future is also causing considerable anxiety for cooperatives' cadre personnel: administrators, team leaders, and specialists. They could find themselves out of work. The peasants are particularly outraged by those functionaries who have accumulated considerable wealth at others' expense and strengthened their power at local level through family ties and "friendship with the secret police."

These conflicts in rural areas are holding back spring work. This is most noticeable in mountainous and hilly areas, where one-man land management has been and still is the most efficient method but where there are a considerable number of cooperatives. That is why it is so tricky to sort the situation out.

However, the war of nerves is being waged everywhere. Decisions adopted by peasants belonging to cooperatives at their meetings are frequently overturned at civic meetings by a different segment of the peasantry not in agreement with the collective farm workers. Mutual threats and pressure sometimes spill over into clashes. These are not only prompted by fundamental questions concerning the apportionment of land but also by elementary abuses. There are also a considerable number of examples where peasants who have acquired land for "long-term use" and prepared it for sowing have found themselves without land again just two weeks later: the land has been transferred to other hands in line with "an even fairer" method of dividing land.

Agricultural specialists have remarked on the ambiguity of many of the present land laws. That is natural, in my view. After all, the decrees adopted in haste immediately after the revolution were, to a considerable extent, political declarations. The new authorities were marking out their programmatic, reformist objectives at the time. The trouble is that, in many cases, there has been no one to apply them in practice to the land. Just like the cities, rural areas have an acute sense of the temporary nature of the present institutions of power. Everyone is waiting for the parliamentary elections. The prospects for resolving Romania's food problem remain unclear.

Yakovlev Receives Romanian, Polish Envoys

LD0704183290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Text] Yakovlev, member of the USSR Presidential Council and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received today Sandru, ambassador of Romania to the USSR. During the conversation, which was conducted in a friendly atmosphere, some topical questions of Soviet-Romanian relations were discussed.

The same day, Comrade Yakovlev received Ciosek, ambassador of Poland to the USSR. Several aspects of Soviet-Polish relations have been considered. Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev, at the request of the ambassador, talked about the topical problems of the development of Soviet society, about the progress of preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress, and the activity of the USSR Presidential Council.

First Soviet Troops Leave East Bohemia Region

LD1004114590 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 0800 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] [Announcer] The first Soviet Army units are leaving the East Bohemian Region. Our correspondent, Premysl Sramek, phones in this report from Hradec Kralove:

[Sramek] A special train is leaving Kraliky station in Usti nad Orlici District today. Its destination is the trans-loading station at Cierna nad Tisou near Cop. The train has been loaded with mainly small items of military equipment and the furniture of Soviet officers' families based in Cervena Voda. They are vacating a total of 73 apartments, which will enable the local National Committee to house all those currently on its waiting list for apartments. Interest in the other buildings is being shown by a number of different organizations, and they are expected to be used as warehouses, among other things.

A complete unit of chemical troops has already left Cervena Voda, heading east. The remaining 500-or-so troops and their equipment are scheduled to follow them this Friday, 13 April. That certainly will be a happy day for the people of this corner of East Bohemia.

20 Soviet Helicopters Leave Prague for Home

LD0904185990 Prague CTK in English 1829 GMT 9 Apr 90

[Text] Bratislava April 9 (CTK)—Twenty Soviet Mi-8 and Mi-24 helicopters left Sliac, central Slovakia for the USSR today.

They belonged to the helicopter unit of the Soviet Army stationed at Olomouc, north Moravia, which made a stop-over at the Sliac airport on their way home last Wednesday.

Another 42 helicopters from the same unit are scheduled to leave for home tomorrow.

Views on Soviet Troops in Hungary Pondered

PM0604095790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 Apr 90 First Edition p 5

[Article by A. Pronin of the USSR Defense Ministry Press Center pegged to the "45th Anniversary of Hungary's Liberation from the Fascist Aggressors": "In a Land that Was Saved"]

[Text] Budapest-Moscow—On Gellert Hill, in the center of Budapest, there stands a monument—a symbol of the Hungarians' gratitude to those who brought them long-awaited liberation from fascist slavery in 1945.

"Hungarians are grateful to the Soviet liberators," Gyula Biro, executive secretary of the Hungarian-Soviet Friendship Society, told me. "Had it not been for the assistance of the USSR and other countries of the anti-Hitler coalition, the fascists' monstrous plans would have been realized."

Comrade Biro is an old friend of our country. He talked, for example, about the assistance the Hungarian-Soviet Friendship Society is providing, in conjunction with the Hungarian Red Cross, in establishing the names of Soviet soldiers who died in Hungary and where they are buried. And, according to the All-Union Book of Remembrance, there are 79,339 lying in Hungarian soil. And although so many years have passed since the victory, there are still unmarked graves here.

Our Hungarian friends are taking great care to ensure that the memory of the dead heroes does not get overgrown by the weeds of oblivion. In several units of the Southern Group of Forces they mentioned the name of Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP] veteran Magda Kays [name as transliterated]. She organized the "Flame of Freedom" action among Hungarian young pioneers. The result of it was a book containing tens of thousands of names of fallen Soviet troops and descriptions of where they are buried. They also talk with gratitude in the Southern Group of Forces about Szilveszter Foldes—for more than 40 years he has been tending the grave of six of our soldiers in the village of Shorokapatka [name as transliterated]. Bela Koszta, a schoolteacher from the city of Kunhegyes, had been carrying out an independent search for the burial places of Soviet troops and has identified the names of over 100 heroes. There are many similar examples.

But, unfortunately, there are other things accompanying this commemoration of war. The new realities, associated with the activities of a number of political parties in the country, are making their mark on attitudes toward the Soviet soldier's liberation mission. On 13th February this year, the 45th anniversary of the liberation of Budapest, it was only representatives of the reborn MSZMP and public organizations close to it in spirit who laid wreaths at the foot of the Liberation Monument on Gellert Hill in Budapest. As of this year, Hungarian Liberation Day, 4 April, which used to be a major holiday, is a working day.

When I was in Budapest I could not help noticing an empty plinth surrounded by scaffolding. Only recently, I was told, it supported a monument to Lenin.

The Szekesfehervar City Council decided to remove a T-34 tank from its plinth. The same fate has befallen two monuments in the city of Gyor, and a monument and Soviet soldiers' grave in the city of Vac is being moved.

Hooliganism against our soldiers in the Southern Group of Forces has increased, unfortunately. In Debrecen someone fired a shot from a passing car at a Soviet military unit main gate checkpoint. In the same city some of our servicemen were sprayed with a blinding agent. I realize that these were attacks by hooligans, yet it pains me when I think: Do the children and grandchildren of those who liberated the Hungarian land from fascism really deserve this? It is not only we who are asking this question today. It is also being asked by Hungarians who have been friends with Soviet people for decades.

To be honest, relations between Soviet units stationed on Hungarian territory and the local populace have not always been easy, although they have always been described in the past as a bed of roses. There have been traffic accidents caused by our soldiers and other unpleasant incidents. Incidentally, the number has dropped sharply in the past two years. OK, so on one side of the scales we have the bad. But how much is there on the other side to offset it?

...Many Hungarians will remember January 1987 for a long time. It was a winter of unprecedented severity. Ice. Blizzards. Thousands of cars, buses, and trucks were trapped by the snow. People were freezing to death in their vehicles. It is hard to say how the Hungarians would have survived were it not for the assistance of troops of the Southern Group of Forces. Tanks fitted with snow-clearing attachments swept the streets, highways, and railroads clear of drifts. Dozens of our vehicles carried food and medicines to population centers cut off by snow. Altogether, 3,000 Soviet servicemen and over 600 units of equipment participated in clearing up after the natural calamity.

And how many Hungarian lives were saved by our engineers under the command of officer Morozov, when they dealt with a fascist ammunition dump left over from the war in a densely populated area? Or what might have happened if the fire at a local bakery had not been extinguished by Sergeant Peshekhonov and his comrades? Like that other fire that raged in the fields of a cooperative—Senior Warrant Officer Uminskiy, Sergeant Korolev, and Privates Narzulloyev and Ashurov fought for many hours to put it out....

"Until recently we had constant and fruitful links with Hungarian military units," Lieutenant Colonel Martynov, political deputy commander of a tank regiment, said. "Joint actions at tactical exercises, exchange of experience of combat and political training, sports events, evenings of amateur artistic activity—we have had all this, and none of it will be forgotten, of course...."

In his opinion, and in the opinion of other commanders and political personnel of the Southern Group of Forces, these contacts have declined somewhat of late. They do not put it down to a cooling of the relationship. No, many people, of course, still have fraternal feelings for the Soviet comrades. But public expressions of them are not very popular any more.

Yes, this is a reality. Apparently, certain forces want to erase from Hungarians' memories the good things that have held us together.

The withdrawal of Soviet forces is taking place in an atmosphere of openness. This year around 70 percent of all troops and materiel are to be transferred to the USSR; the rest are to go before 30 June 1991.

"We are leaving, but good memories of us will remain"—this is the belief of all the men, officers, and warrant officers I talked with. They will not only remain in Hungarian working people's thoughts and feelings. They will be manifested in a very tangible, physical way.

"A total of 493 apartment blocks (16,268 apartments), 47 hostels and hotels, 146 barracks accommodating 17,325 people, and 69 dining rooms accommodating 24,825 diners will be handed over to the Hungarians," Major General I. Mikulin, chief of the Southern Group of Forces Poliical Directorate and Military Council member, said.

...In a Moscow-bound aircraft that had taken off from Tokol Airfield, Marina Suslova, wife of a Soviet military pilot, told me how sad she had been to say good-bye to a particular Hungarian family. During her stay in the country, Marina said, she had fallen in love with the Hungarian people and was going home with good memories.

I recalled the words of Hungarian Democratic Forum Chairman J. Antall, uttered at a meeting with voters in the capital's "Budapest" sports complex:

"We will present a bouquet of flowers to the last Soviet soldier to leave Hungary."

USSR-Bulgaria Diplomatic 'Consultations' Held

AU0604154590 Sofia NARODNA ARMIYA in Bulgarian 4 Apr 90 p 4

[BTA report: "Consultations on Disarmament Questions"]

[Text] Consultations on disarmament issues were held between representatives of the Foreign Ministries of Bulgaria and the USSR in Sofia on 2 and 3 April 1990. The Soviet delegation was headed by Boris Krasulin, first deputy chief of the International Organizations Administration at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Bulgarian delegation was headed by Todor Dichev, chief of the UN and Disarmament Department at the Bulgarian Foreign Affairs Ministry.

E. Europe, Soviet Unemployment Prospects Viewed

PM0504140090 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 4 Apr 90 p 3

[A. Chursin report: "A Line of Superfluous People Can Be Seen Increasingly Frequently at the Labor Exchanges in Eastern Europe"]

[Text] Quite recently hardly anyone would have imagined that the unemployment problem would be relevant to us, too. Our official propaganda used to claim proudly that the socialist countries had put an end forever to this "ignominious birthmark" of capitalism. However, today alarming reports are coming in increasingly frequently from the GDR, Poland, Hungary, and Vietnam on tens and even hundreds of thousands of unemployed. In some places the first labor exchanges are already opening, and unemployment benefit is being paid...

There are no concrete statistics as yet, but all the same, on the basis of the available sources—which unfortunately are by no means complete—let us try to draw up an approximate picture of the situation on the manpower market in a number of socialist countries. Thus at present there are 70,000 unemployed in the GDR, 1.2 million in Yugoslavia, 226,000 in Poland, 30,000 in Hungary, about 6 million in the Soviet Union, and 12 million (!) in Vietnam.

The predictions of experts who are studying the situation carefully are not very reassuring. In Yugoslavia, where the unemployment level among young people is already approaching 70 percent, a further deterioration in the situation is expected, which could in the near future increase the army of superfluous people by another 1.5 million.

The economic program adopted by the Polish Government also does not rule out the appearance of a surplus manpower market. According to preliminary assessments, this year alone between 400,000 and 1.7 million Poles could be left without a job.

In Hungary it is believed that in the early nineties there will be more than 100,000 unemployed. The results of a sociological study conducted there are even more alarming—one-fourth of all those employed in the national economy fear future dismissal.

The Soviet Union offers a comparatively varied and contradictory picture in terms of employment. Thus, for instance, whereas in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, Belorussia, and the Ukraine, as well as the Baltic republics, there is an acute shortage of manpower, in Central Asia and the Caucasus there is a substantial surplus. Here the number of unemployed people of working age is 50-100 percent higher than the average indicators for the country as a whole.

Mistakes in regional development are often the cause of mass industrial unemployment among the population. In Slovenia, which has a comparatively highly developed economy, unemployment is only 2.5 percent of the working-age population, while in the autonomous province of Kosovo, which has virtually no industry of its own, the figure is 57.5 percent.

In the developed capitalist countries, in particular the United States, job information banks have long since been set up and operate successfully; data on labor reserves and vacant jobs are fed into them. In the socialist countries, however, they are only just embarking on the development of a similar information system. But as Western experience shows, computer records alone cannot resolve all the problems. After all, the search for a new job often involves not only a change of workplace, but a change of residence. This in turn puts new and difficult social questions on the agenda—the search for housing, a kindergarten place, a school place....

Sociological polls carried out in the USSR show that only 15 percent of those polled expressed readiness to transfer to a different enterprise on the same terms, and only five percent agreed to transfer to a different locality if absolutely necessary. A similar situation is characteristic of Hungary. Despite the fact that a special resettlement plant is paid there, very few people are willing to leave their familiar places.

Employment in the East European countries will be affected considerably by the switch to market principles. Thus, for instance, the introduction of economic accountability in the USSR has released some 3 million people in the last three years alone. And according to experts by the year 2005 this figure will rise to 15-16 million.

In these conditions it is difficult to manage without the support of major Western financial institutions. But that is a two-edged sword. Hungary, for instance, in order to receive the IMF credit it needs to modernize the national economy, will have to fulfill fairly tough conditions: cut subsidies on consumer goods, devalue the national currency, and consistently close unprofitable enterprises. Some 50 Hungarian firms and enterprises are to be closed this year.

Hungarian economists, believing that unemployment is inevitable, are proposing that measures to alleviate its social consequences should be embarked on immediately. Rather than reinventing the bicycle, they have decided to turn to Western experience—to allocate funds for unemployment grants, professional retraining, the development of private initiative, and the creation of additional jobs. Here reference is frequently made to the experience of Sweden, where every year some 2 percent of national income is spent on the unemployment stabilization program. Japanese experience also merits attention. Here the unemployment insurance fund is formed from monthly deductions from enterprises' wage funds and the working people's own wages.

There are plenty of formulas for preventing unemployment, but none that make it possible to eliminate it entirely in a market economy. For the East European countries unemployment is no longer a taboo subject.

West Europe

British Foreign Secretary Hurd Continues Visit

Details of Talks Reported

LD1004150390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1410 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 10 Apr (TASS)—Discussion of the situation in the field of disarmament was the central issue in the course of the first part of talks between Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, and Douglas Hurd, secretary of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs, a senior official of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs said at a briefing here today.

He said that both sides stressed the importance of completing work on a treaty on reducing conventional armed forces and armaments in Europe this year. Both ministers noted the key importance of this work for preparing and thinking over the idea of the meeting of the leaders of the European countries, the United States and Canada scheduled for late this year. The Soviet side noted that at this meeting it would be important to sign not only an accord on reducing armaments, but also an agreement on confidence measures. It also was said that the West cannot indefinitely avoid the inclusion of the issue of naval forces in the sphere of talks.

Speaking about the Vienna talks, the Soviet diplomat continued, Eduard Shevardnadze pointed out the importance of attaining an accord on those issues that have not yet been settled. He drew attention to the need for an accord on aviation and also to the issue of limiting the levels of Armed Forces on both sides in Central Europe. The Soviet minister noted the special topicality of this problem in connection with the events taking place in the region, specifically with the processes of unification in Germany.

According to the Foreign Ministry representative, Eduard Shevardnadze underlined the feasibility of concluding a convention on prohibiting chemical weapons as early as 1990-91 and voiced a thought on the need to intensify consultations on issues relating to the "Open Skies" talks. He also drew attention to the importance of the problem of tactical nuclear weapons, and noted the USSR's readiness to discuss also the concept of minimum nuclear deterrence, adhered to by NATO, at the corresponding consultations.

In the course of the talks, the USSR Foreign Ministry representative went on, a rather high degree of coincidence of approaches and positions of the sides was demonstrated regarding a Middle East settlement. The ministers remarked on the possibility of a Soviet-British partnership in the matter of a settlement in the region.

Touching on the Cyprus problem, Eduard Shevardnadze gave assurances that the USSR would do everything possible for settling it.

Answering the question of whether or not the ministers discussed events connected with Lithuania, the senior Foreign Ministry representative said that "at the negotiating table the issue of Lithuania was not discussed."

Shevardnadze Hails 'Partnership'

LD1004142390 Moscow TASS in English 1414 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 10 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze today compared the recent close Soviet-British relations to a "partnership" focusing on common European problems.

He was speaking at a luncheon for British Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd after their first round of talks in Moscow. Hurd arrived in the USSR on Monday on a three-day official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

Shevardnadze said Europe has a unique mechanism for executing constructive policies—the Helsinki process, which is kept in motion by ever new ideas. In this connection he supported British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's ideas, put forward in Cambridge.

Shevardnadze took issue with claims by some politicians that common European structures cannot provide adequate security guarantees and that solutions to all urgent European issues should be sought exclusively within the framework of existing alliances.

"One cannot fail to see that the policy of blocs has clearly discernible limits and, with time, will have to be abandoned. A step-by-step approach is inevitable and even essential in these matters.

"But who is preventing us from taking the first decisions as early as this year, at a summit of the 35 countries involved in the Helsinki process? Who is preventing us from laying the required groundwork by the time Helsinki-II is convened, and then moving on?," Shevardnadze said.

Speaking about the Soviet approach to German reunification, he said the USSR "unconditionally supports synchronising the creation of a united Germany with the positive evolution of the Helsinki process".

"The Soviet Union does not question the German people's right to self-determination. But a new development like a united Germany will seriously change the European military-political landscape. The path to unification, we are convinced, lies through Helsinki.

"Attempts to squeeze Germany into the procrustean bed of bloc structures have dangerous implications for European equilibrium," Shevardnadze said.

Hurd Notes 'Serious Improvement'

LD1004150990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1415 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 10 Apr (TASS)—After the end of the first round of Soviet-British talks, which began here this morning, USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze gave a luncheon in honor of Douglas Hurd, secretary of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs. The British minister is in the USSR on an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

In his speech at the luncheon, Douglas Hurd noted the serious improvement in Soviet-British relations, and between the East and West as a whole, stressing that "USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and the whole Soviet Government have made a great contribution to this." Douglas Hurd highly appraised the changes taking place in the Soviet Union—the democraticization of society and economic reforms—stressing that his government "welcomes the improvement of the USSR's position in observing human rights and other duties in accordance with the Helsinki and other agreements."

Speaking of European policy problems, Douglas Hurd noted that "the political transformations in Eastern Europe and Germany open up new possibilities for the meeting on security and cooperation in Europe." At the same time, he noted that although Great Britain considers that "NATO should, as before, have a real input into European stability," his country's government sees this meeting as "the forum at which a broad discussion on the issue of new European structures should take place." "The general European summit meeting this year, the idea of which was originally proposed by Mikhail Gorbachev, could be used for strengthening stability on our continent; reinforcing the principles of democracy, legality, and the market economy; and giving an impulse to cooperation between East and West," he said.

Gorbachev, Hurd Hold Talks

PM1104092190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian Second Edition 11 Apr 90 pp 1-2

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev Receives Douglas Hurd"]

[Text] On 10 April the USSR president received Douglas Hurd, secretary of state for foreign affairs of Great Britain. Acquainting himself with the minister, Mikhail Gorbachev gave his appraisal of Soviet-British relations. They are open for discussion on any question, he said. Through joint efforts we have reached a degree of mutual understanding and trust which enables us, without wasting time on niceties, to get down to the crux of the matter. Despite problems which arise, these relations are mainly in line with the times and affect the mutual balanced nature of approaches to even complex issues. On one of these, the German question, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, referring to his telephone conversation with Mrs. Thatcher and her recent letter, stated that the positions are fairly close.

At the same time, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev gave a detailed substantiation of the Soviet Union's unacceptance of a unified Germany joining NATO. Mistrust cannot be permitted to arise. The great political capital in international affairs, which enables us to work together in a new way and to face the future with more confidence, should not be depreciated because of this. A solution must be sought in creating new security structures for all of Europe—from the Atlantic to the Urals. And we must accelerate the process of shaping such a structure, by synchronizing the unification of Germany with it. Meanwhile some kind of transitional stage is possible. We are prepared for a constructive quest. We believe that even more difficult questions can be solved if there is mutual understanding and each other's interests are taken into account. But the Soviet people will not accept any solution which will disturb the strategic balance which has developed. Our former allies in the anti-Hitlerite coalition should not cause Soviet society anxiety.

Touching on Soviet-U.S. relations and Eduard Shevardnadze's recent visit to Washington, and again stressing the importance of U.S. participation in the European process, Mikhail Gorbachev said that if there are worries in connection with the big changes in Western and Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union, then we must try to eliminate them. We will work intensively to ensure the success of the Soviet-U.S. meeting in June. We hope to find satisfactory solutions to questions of strategic arms reductions which are not yet resolved.

Mikhail Gorbachev again invited the UK and other nuclear powers to think about ending nuclear testing. This would promptly have a strong and positive impact on the whole peace process.

In response to Douglas Hurd's request, Mikhail Gorbachev described his policy on the Lithuanian question. Lithuania is unlucky. The adventuristic actions of the present leadership may cost the Lithuanian people, the Soviet Union, and international peace dearly. It [the leadership] is simply exploiting perestroyka, democratization, glasnost, and the new thinking for destructive aims.

We are manifesting the maximum political goodwill, although it is becoming more and more difficult to do. Our position is quite clear. We have the mandate of the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies. No one has the right to rescind it. The situation as it stood on 10 March must be restored. And then, if the Lithuanian people, whose opinion they are truly afraid to ask, still want to secede from the USSR—that is their right, it is provided for both in the Constitution and in the recently-adopted law. However, everything must proceed strictly in keeping with the framework of legality. The duty of the president, as in any other country, is to defend the Constitution. And that will be done. Although it is precisely out of respect for the Lithuanian people that we do not want to scatter to the wind the positive and good, things that have been accumulated over many decades of joint life!

The problem arising from the Lithuanian leadership's fault is of international significance not only from the point of view of preserving everything that has been achieved thanks to the new thinking. Problems of a federal state in contemporary conditions exist not only in the Soviet Union. And the attempts to resolve these problems by anti-constitutional, voluntaristic means, as they are trying to do in the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, is a bad precedent for all states with a federal or similar structure.

That is exclusively our internal question, Mikhail Gorbachev said, but we hope for the understanding of all who adhere to the principles of legality and law.

Bidding farewell to Douglas Hurd, Mikhail Gorbachev asked him to convey his greetings to Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and expressed the hope that indepth conversations will be held during her visit to the Soviet Union this summer.

Eduard Shevardnadze and Ambassadors Roderick Braithwaite and Leonid Zamyatin were present.

Nuclear Disasters Accord Signed

LD1004204390 Moscow TASS in English 1942 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 10 TASS—Talks began here today between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and British Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs Douglas Hurd, who is in the Soviet Union on an official visit.

The ministers discussed in detail problems of disarmament. They both noted the importance of the successful conclusion of talks on the reduction of conventional arms in Europe, which would make possible the signing of a treaty at the summit meeting of the leaders of European countries, the United States, and Canada at the end of 1990.

An important step in this direction is the agreement on levels of Soviet and U.S. land and air forces outside national territories in central Europe, which must be fixed at the Vienna talks.

Eduard Shevardnadze drew the attention to the need to reduce the number of NATO and Warsaw Pact conventional armed forces in central Europe to 700,000—750,000 men and to establish a limit of 500 pieces of Soviet and U.S. combat aircraft beyond their national territories in Europe.

The British side expressed readiness to study Soviet proposals for the air forces. As regards limits for NATO and WTO [Warsaw Treaty Organization] armed forces, the British side favoured examining them within the next stage of talks.

Eduard Shevardnadze pointed out that an agreement on confidence-building measures, including in the field of naval activity, should be prepared in time for the European summit.

The two ministers noted that it would be most important to begin thinking about the specific content of the next stage of talks—the so-called Vienna-2. Shevardnadze proposed taking practical steps to begin elaborating these questions.

Both sides expressed their intent to make further efforts to look for compromise solutions to issues that remain open at the talks on open skies.

Shevardnadze noted that the idea of open skies proclaimed as a confidence building measure, must be realized as such, without attempting to gain unilateral advantages at the expense of other's interests.

The ministers stated with satisfaction the constructive nature of Soviet-British cooperation in working out a convention on the ban on and the elimination of chemical weapons. Methods of the elimination of the available chemical weapon stocks could be added to the traditional field of close consultations—supervision.

Shevardnadze again drew attention to the Soviet proposal to begin consultations on short-range nuclear weapons in Europe, to be followed, in due time, by official talks.

The Soviet Union, he said, is prepared to discuss during consultations also the concept of minimum nuclear deterrence as a stage on the way towards the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

The sides also agreed to intensify dialogue about the nonproliferation of missiles and missile technologies.

The ministers began discussion of regional issues. Their approaches towards the settlement in the Middle East were found to have a great degree of poroximity and identity. Both sides favor the beginning of dialogue between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organisation.

It was noted that consultations among the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council concerning aspects of the Middle East settlement and the appointment of the U.N. secretary-general's special Middle East envoy could be very useful.

As regards the problem of settlement in Cyprus, the ministers expressed support for the efforts of the U.N. secretary-general and stated their intention to contribute in every possible way to the progress in the solution of this problem.

Soviet-British talks will continue.

Eduard Shevardnadze and Douglas Hurd signed an agreement between the governments of the Soviet Union and Great Britain on emergency notification about nuclear disasters, on the exchange of information about operating and controlling nuclear installations, and on cooperation in the field of culture, education and science.

Talks End; Hurd Heads for Leningrad

LD1104100890 Moscow TASS in English 0945 GMT 11 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 11 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and his visiting British counterpart Douglas Hurd ended their talks here today after discussing a wide range of issues, including security, disarmament and regional conflicts.

Shevardnadze and Hurd signed intergovernmental agreements on the prompt notification of nuclear accidents and exchanges of information about the use and control of nuclear installations, and on cooperation in culture, education and science.

Hurd was received by President Mikhail Gorbachev on Tuesday.

The British foreign secretary leaves Moscow for Leningrad this afternoon.

Commentary on Hopes, Expectations of Hurd Visit

LD1004155990 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] The British Foreign Secretary, Douglas Hurd, arrived in Moscow on Monday for an official visit. Till Thursday, meetings and talks with him will occupy an important place in the schedule of his Soviet counterpart, Eduard Shevardnadze. The head of the Foreign Office will be received by President Mikhail Gorbachev. Mikhail Mayorov makes this comment, and this is what he writes:

Before the visit Douglas Hurd said he was going to Moscow in a good mood. The feelings of such a high-ranking political figure visiting the Soviet Union for the first time are a reliable indicator. It seems Soviet-British relations have passed the stage of stagnation and decline. Many analysts attribute this to the personal good relationship between Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and President Gorbachev. This is an important matter in big-time politics, of course. At the end of last month the two leaders again had a conversation, this time by phone. In June they are expected to meet.

In the past few years Moscow and London have grown much closer to each other, though the ideas of Soviet perestroyka don't always coincide with the policies of British Conservatives. In the old days, London's refusal to accept the Soviet proposal on fully scrapping nuclear weapons in Europe would be enough to draw the two countries apart, but today the clearly outstanding personalities heading the Soviet Union and Britain are looking hard for spheres of cooperation, not confrontation. For example, the approaches of the two countries to Germany's unification are somewhat similar. The process of unification cannot run counter to the interests of European security as a whole, or those of neighbors of the two German states. The Thatcher government, though, supports unified Germany's membership in NATO. But Moscow and London see eye to eye on the necessity of continuing the Helsinki process. This coincidence of views can be considered as a foundation for bringing them even closer.

It would be an illusion to think that there are no other reefs in Soviet-British relations. Such an issue as humanitarian problems was defused only recently. Now questions related to the protection of human rights have gone to a sphere of mutual understanding and cooperation. The situation in and outside Lithuania is becoming a subject of the Soviet-British dialogue. I hope the acuteness of the problem will not complicate relations with Britain, all the more so since the foreign ministers of the two countries still have much to do to raise the standard of Soviet-British trade and economic partnership to a new level. In this connection, Douglas Hurd said a long road remains to be traversed. But let's count bilateral contacts and good signs given by both sides, not the kilometers or miles separating Moscow and London. The statistics of contacts can give one an idea of the degree of Soviet and British readiness to further deepen relations, useful not only for the two countries but all Europeans.

Biryukova Leads Delegation at London Drug Forum

LD0904205190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1325 GMT 9 Apr 90

[Excerpts] London, 9 Apr (TASS)—TASS correspondent Yuriy Sidorov reports: An international conference on combatting the spread of cocaine and on reducing the demand for drugs, organized by the Government of Great Britain and the UN, opened here today. Taking part in its work are representatives from more than 110 states and influential international organizations, which have resolved to pool their experience, knowledge, and achievements in this sphere. The Soviet delegation is led by A.P. Biryukova, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee. [passage omitted]

Noting the extraordinary importance of the forum, Biryukova stated that until very recently, the main measures at national and international levels concentrated on strengthening drugs control, combatting illegal trade in them, and on the drugs business. However, the international community failed to achieve decisive success, she pointed out, "and in the main, because we were fighting the consequence and not the causes; with the symptoms of the disease and not that which caused it."

Singling out, in this regard, the need to reduce the demand for drugs, the head of the Soviet delegation suggested that those taking part in the conference should establish a strategy in this sphere, proceeding from the fact that "drug addiction is born first and foremost by social and cultural living conditions and only later in the plantations of cocoa, poppy, and in chemical laboratories." For this reason, she said, in combatting this disease, it is necessary to turn fully toward the individual, and to unite the efforts of representatives of the most varied scientific disciplines, sociologists and medics, psychologists and jurists to resolve this task.

Further, Biryukova stressed, we feel that reducing the demand for drugs is a task which should be developed primarily among young people, teenagers, and even children. For this reason, the role of the family and school is of the first order.

According to information cited in the speech by the head of the Soviet delegation, about 130,000 people currently use drugs in the USSR, and the rate at which this malpractice is growing has been increasing of late. Dwelling on measures being taken in our country to combat this social evil, Biryukova stated that in the first instance, drugs control is being strengthened: State sowing of wild hemp is being reduced; sowing of oil poppy has been ended. Apart from that, in 1987, a law was adopted which makes possible measures to exert social, administrative, and medical influence with regard to individuals who misuse drugs. A union-wide comprehensive program of struggle against the misuse of drugs and illegal trade in them has also been developed. At the same time, more and more attention is being devoted, Biryukova noted, to preventive measures against drug abuse in the milieu potentially most subject to it, that is, among schoolchildren, students, young working people. All these measures, she pointed out, are starting to produce results: Last year a trend towards a reduction in the number of schoolchildren and college students who use drugs was discernible.

In the view of the Soviet delegation, a turn toward reducing the demand for drugs also requires the search for new forms of international cooperation in resolving this problem. In this respect, the Soviet delegation proposed the establishment, on the basis of the UN, UNESCO, and the WHO, of programs for exchanging scientific achievements, and the dissemination of experience in social work to reduce the demand for drugs. [passage omitted]

PRAVDA's Frolov Receives Maxwell, UK Envoy

PM0404161990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5

["Own Information" report: "'We Wish Perestroyka Success.' Meetings at Editorial Office"]

[Text] "We belong to different parties. I am a Labor man, you are Communists. But we have great respect for your efforts to renew the party and we wish perestroyka success."

Those were the words with which Robert Maxwell, prominent British businessman and chairman of the Maxwell Communications Corporation, concluded his conversation at our editorial office. He was paying a short visit to Moscow to discuss prospects and plans for cooperation with Soviet organizations and departments.

During the meeting at the editorial office R. Maxwell and I.T. Frolov, CPSU Central Committee secretary and chief editor of PRAVDA, discussed the program for this cooperation, which concerns exchanges of information and groups of journalists and the preparation of specific publications which Maxwell Communications and PRAVDA are to develop together. The sides noted their mutual interest in developing ties between PRAVDA and the corporation's newspapers in order to strengthen mutual understanding and good-neighborliness between the USSR and Britain and build the common European home.

I.T. Frolov, CPSU Central Committee secretary and chief editor of PRAVDA, received R.Q. Braithwaite, British ambassador to the USSR, at the latter's request 3 April.

Correspondent Files First Dispatch for PRAVDA

PM0904090790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5

[Aleksandr Lyutyy dispatch: "Observing Britain"]

[Excerpts] Aleksandr Lyutyy, our own correspondent in Great Britain, has started working in London. His name is already well known to PRAVDA readers, partly through his reports from London, where he has previously spent several months.

Our new own correspondent is 36, he has worked for PRAVDA since February 1987, and he came to us from TASS. Today we present his first major, or as journalists say, maiden report for the readers to judge. [passage omitted]

What about relations between Britain and our country? I am not ruling out the idea that M. Thatcher's consistency and predictability played a positive role both in British foreign policy and particularly in our bilateral relations. There is no lack of problems and differences of opinion in these relations, primarily concerning views on the role of nuclear weapons in the modern world. But dialogue is becoming more dynamic and constructive every year.

It has frequently been noted that even during her meeting with M.S. Gorbachev in December 1984 M. Thatcher, with her sharp political flair, perceived the imminent transition of our society to a qualitatively new state. She subsequently supported perestroyka and, it seems, sincerely wishes it success.

The two countries' attitudes to a whole number of international problems are quite close. This concerns German unification, for example. M. Thatcher adheres to a considered, careful position, believing that unification should be gradual, not pose a threat to its neighbors' territorial interests and security, and not complicate European East-West policy as a whole. Although it must be added that our positions differ on the NATO question and on keeping U.S. and British forces on German soil.

M. Thatcher's government is approaching the Lithuanian situation with caution, not wanting to exacerbate the situation, and with some understanding. It seems that side by side with other factors, there is also the boomerang factor in operation—the separatist tendencies that are still quite strong in the British Isles. London has been involved in a sectarian conflict in Northern Ireland for over 20 years and is only irritating the wound with its "surgical intervention."

M. Thatcher will visit our country in summer of this year. And 9 April Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd will come to Moscow to discuss a wide complex of problems. "My visit fits very well into the present structure of Anglo-Soviet relations," he said in a conversation with Soviet journalists on the eve of his trip. "I believe that it will be a logical link in our constantly broadening contacts. I look forward with particular interest to discussing questions of European security."

I would be telling a lie if I said that the ordinary "man in the street" here is more worried about foreign policy problems than my compatriot. The same strictly personal and everyday interests take priority. The Englishman is possibly less interested in problems of arms reduction and the use of the "peace dividend." Because whatever way you look at it, the shelves in the stores are not empty here.

But Englishmen display a lively and stable interest in everything connected with the USSR. The telephone rings every day in our press center—we are invited to speak at schools and colleges and on the radio and television.

"We want to know more about PRAVDA, perestroyka, and your country," one of the callers said. The desire turned out to be mutual. One of the reasons I have come here is to get to know the British better. And maybe find my own answer to the question of what Britain is like. For so many of my compatriots who have come here, this question has remained mysterious and rhetorical. But that's all right, it will make working here that much more interesting....

Warsaw Paper Views Estonian Independence Strategy

AU0904081390 Warsaw ZYCIA WARSZAWY in Polish 4 Apr 90 p 5

[Miroslaw Glogowski commentary: "Estonia On the Road To Independence—A Step By Step Strategy"]

[Text] Estonia is regaining its independence very slowly, surreptitiously, and with surprising determination. This has been the opinion of foreign observers of the small Baltic republic for some time now. It was in Tallin in November 1988, that the republic "proclaimed its sovereignty" for the first time. A sovereignty within the framework of the Soviet Union. It was again in Tallin last spring that Estonian was reintroduced as the main official language, clocks were changed from Moscow to Tallin time (as used before the war), and the right to fly the national blue-black-white flag was approved.

In those days the Estonian parliament took a few more steps along the road to independence. The Estonian republic, forcibly incorporated into the USSR in 1940 as a result of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, was formally reconstituted. At the same time the parliamentary deputies who had gathered in Tallin proclaimed the beginning (only then) of a transition period which is to lead the country to full independence.

No one today can say with any certainty how long this process will now take. The drama of Lithuania, a country which has attempted to cross the rubicon of independence with one single leap, has ensured that even the most determined Estonian proponents of leaving the Soviet Union have now become cautious. "The Lithuanians made a very bad mistake, they humiliated a superpower. We have chosen a more subtle policy of one step at a time. We have called it our transition period. It will take another year to resolve all political matters and three to five years to resolve all economic ones, plus others," states Mikk Titma, former secretary of the Estonian Communist Party.

An essential element of the Estonian plan is the fact that Tallin never begins anything from absolute zero. The reconstruction of Estonia's separate identity, a process that began some two years ago with patriotic manifestations and gatherings to honor the victims of Stalinist terror, is now well advanced. The extent of its progress should not just be measured by the presence of national flags and last year's symbolic move of removing the teaching of scientific communism (replaced by courses in political science) from all higher education institutes in Tallin. It should be measured by the ever-widening gulf that exists between the standard of living in Estonia and the standards existing in the remaining constituent parts of the Soviet Union.

This is not simply a question of wealth, as this has always been higher in the Baltic states than elsewhere in the Soviet Union. Estonian economic autonomy, doggedly negotiated in Moscow, has to a large degree become a fact. Estonian currency has been prepared. A customs barrier along the republic's borders has already been put into place. The process of calculating the balances of payments between the center in Moscow and Tallin has already begun. Those negotiations will also agree the value of property belonging to Estonia and will ascertain what belongs to whom.

A separate judicial system is becoming more and more discernible in Estonia. Tallin did not bow to Moscow's pressure after the proclamation of sovereignty and the insistence that the national parliament had to ratify every piece of Soviet legislation. Moscow demanded that Estonia submit itself totally to Moscow's jurisdiction in these matters. At times turning a deaf ear to Moscow, and at other times arguing the need to take local conditions into account, Estonia in the meantime has succeeded in building up a body of regulations that regulate a multiparty system, has introduced regulations stopping the influx of Russian-speaking immigrants, and has reformed and liberalized its public law.

The calm and slow process of leaving the Soviet Union will not, however, solve all Estonia's problems. The small republic must of course be wary not to incur Moscow's wrath, which as the Lithuanian developments have shown is a very real threat, but, more seriously, it must also take into account the existence of a strong internal opposition lobby to the republic's independence plans.

In Estonia, only 61 percent of the population consists of indigenous Estonians, the rest consists of other peoples among whom Russians form the largest section. This large minority fears secession and sees it as a threat to its status and the equal rights it presently enjoys.

A sign of the real strength of this so-called federalist group, a group that wants the republic to remain within the Soviet Union was to be seen at the March elections. The movement "Interdvizheniye," which represents the interests of those who support unity with the Soviet Union, secured 30 seats in the Estonian parliament. At the same time, the leaders of this movement issued a warning saying that in the event of Estonia seceding from the Soviet Union they will demand that north-eastern Estonia, a region that is mainly inhabited by Russian-speaking people, remains in the Soviet Union.

The Estonian authorities realize the implications of such a threat. They know that in order to reach independence, a condition sine qua non for the survival of the Estonian people (their proportion of the total inhabitants of Estonia has fallen from 93 percent to 61 percent in the last 50 years), they have to gain the support of at least part of the Estonian Russians. More than half of the indigenous Estonian population supports such a compromise. Tallin sees the continued development of democratic forces in Russia as the real guarantee of its independence. Only such forces will fully accept the desire of other nations to independence. The representatives of the most pro-liberal Russian groupings have already expressed their support for the right of all Soviet republics, including those of Lithuania and Estonia, to self-determination.

The majority of Estonians agree that independence will be best achieved by a policy of one step at a time. A classic example of this policy is shown by the March elections to the Central Committee of the Estonian Communist Party. In reality this party is now liberal-democratic and has only retained its old name for the sake of facilitating contacts with Moscow. The decision of the assembly to continue with the policy of gradual and not a radical rupture with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, has resulted (as happened in Lithuania) in a split and the formation of a breakaway group that wants the Estonian party to remain in an all-Soviet, though reformed party. However, the majority of the Russian-speaking members of the Central Committee of the Estonian Communist Party accepted the assembly's decision and thus in reality accepted the road leading to independence.

Observers at the congress pointed to another feature. Three flags; one red for the Soviet Union; one red with blue and white stripes at the bottom for the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic; and one blue, black, and white flag for independent Estonia, stood together in front of the podium. The world also noted a comment made by one of the congress delegates who, pointing to the flags, commented: "We are quite ready to add a couple more flags if that will help us achieve independence."

Scandinavians React to Events in Lithuania

90UF0025A Moscow TRUD in Russian 29 Mar 90 p 3

[Article by Ye. Nikolayev under the rubric "Pulse of the Planet": "Who Is Inflaming Passions: Comments in the Scandinavian Countries on Events in Lithuania"]

[Text] In the Scandinavian countries there is wide comment on the circumstances in Lithuania. Newspapers and journals of various political leanings are trying to analyze what is occurring in that Soviet republic and why frantic zeal is prevailing over the desire for honest dialogue, discipline, and respect for the state's laws.

Most importantly, who is creating the tension? Many of the publications cannot accept the measures taken by the Lithuanian leaders, who are clearly running counter to Soviet law and are challenging the central authorities. Political observers relate the creation of paramilitary formations to such illegal actions. In this instance they consider Moscow's confiscation of the population's firearms reasonable.

Here is the opinion of the Swedish newspaper SVENSKA DAGBLADET on this issue: "Gorbachev's concern over the weapons was awakened, judging by everything, by the news that 'Sajudis' has begun to compile lists of volunteers who could join a sort of national guard." The Finnish newspaper TIYEDONAKTAYA gives its own idea of the reasons for the tension in Lithuania: "With its decisions, the Lithuanian leadership has created a difficult situation for the Soviet Union. But of course no state, and hardly a great power, will simply yield to dictate, never mind agree to the violation of the integrity of its state territory without its consent—independent of historical justice or injustice."

The Lithuanian leadership's methods of creating pressure do not find support among many of the far-sighted political figures of Scandinavia. Ulpu Iivari, general secretary of the Social-Democratic Party of Finland, declared in an interview with the newspaper UUSI SUOMI that she understood the desire of the Baltic peoples for self-determination. However, according to her opinion they must show exceptional restraint. She stressed that at this stage Lithuania should use the notion of "the right to self-determination" rather than "independence" in its communications. In the opposite case, the situation that has arisen may only cause difficulties for perestroyka, which is contributing to political and economic cooperation in Europe.

In an interview with the Swedish Telegraph Bureau (TT) Sten Andersson, Sweden's minister of foreign affairs, declared that in its treatment of Lithuania "The Soviet Union has demonstrated an approach that no other great power has yet shown." According to TT's transmission of the minister's words, Sweden believes that the state leadership of the Soviet Union is acting responsibly and in accordance with international agreements in its relations with Lithuania: Independence and the corresponding alteration of the borders that existed at the moment when the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe was signed in 1975 by all the European states except Albania cannot be proclaimed unilaterally by Lithuania but rather must be anticipated through treaties with Moscow. The USSR Supreme Soviet, notes TT, is currently examining legislation on the rules governing secession of a republic from the Soviet Union.

In addition it is not hard to notice recently that the tone of the articles of several Western presses which report on events in Lithuania is changing perceptibly. The chill air of former times has even begun to blow. The wind is blowing from beyond the ocean, from where persistent "advice" to the Soviet leadership may be heard. According to the conclusions of these sorts of "advisers," the Danish newspaper POLITIKEN, in an article entitled "Chorus of Fans," writes: "One can understand the feelings of the Lithuanians. However, it is difficult to sympathize with the chorus of fans in the West who promote the development of conflict, approving the Lithuanians' unrealistic expectation concerning future Western help."

Aboimov, Dutch Envoy Discuss German Unification

PM0504082590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Mar 90 Moscow Evening Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] I.P. Aboimov, USSR deputy foreign minister, received P. Buwalda, Netherlands ambassador to the USSR, at the latter's request. They exchanged opinions on questions associated with the problem of German unification.

New Ambassador to Vatican Grants Interview

PM0304154990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[G. Deyev profile of and interview with Yu.Ye. Karlov, new USSR envoy to Vatican: "To Maintain Contacts With the Vatican"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Yuriy Yevgenyevich Karlov USSR representative for maintaining contacts with the Vatican, with the rank of ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary.

Yu. Karlov was born in 1937 and is a Russian. He graduated from the USSR Foreign Ministry's Moscow State Institute of International Relations in 1961. He worked at the USSR Embassy in Romania (1961-1963), in the USSR Foreign Ministry First European Department (1963-1967), and at the USSR Embassy in Italy (1967-1972). From 1972 to 1978 he was first secretary and counselor of the USSR Foreign Ministry First European Department. From 1978 to 1985 he was counselor and counselor-envoy at the USSR Embassy in Italy and simultaneously USSR consul general to San Marino. From 1984 to 1986 he was deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry First European Department. From 1986 to 1989 he was executive secretary of the USSR UNESCO Commission.

Yu. Karlov's new appointment is thus no accident. He has been working on Vatican questions for almost 30 years now. His candidate's dissertation, which he defended in 1965, was also devoted to this theme.

Your IZVESTIYA correspondent congratulated Yu. Karlov on his appointment and asked for his comments on this event.

"My present work," the diplomat said, "has one specific feature. As is well known, diplomatic relations have still not been established bwteen the USSR and the Vatican. But official contacts are being actively organized. For the time being the envoys will not have permanent accreditation. Before the establishment of diplomatic relations we must make periodic trips to Rome and Moscow. In the process, each of the representatives will enjoy all the rights and privileges of ambassadors.

"This is surely the first time in the entire history of relations between Russia or the Soviet state and the Vatican that it has been proposed to inaugurate an official channel for bilateral ties and institute direct political dialogue. This demarche is connected with the affirmation of the new political thinking in world politics. There will be a definite place in bilateral relations for the search for mutual understanding and cooperation on present-day global problems whose solution will determine mankind's future and its spiritual and moral well-being. I have in mind the reduction of the world ecological threat, the preservation of mankind's spiritual and cultural heritage, and the development of broad and equal international cooperation.

"The second range of problems includes the solution of specific international questions where the interests of the Soviet Union and the Vatican directly collide. We are beginning to cooperate in the framework of the all-European process. I believe that we will be able to make a useful joint contribution to a Near East settlement, too.

"We have questions to put to one another from the viewpoint of bilateral relations, too, including problems connected with the activity of the Catholic Church on USSR territory. I hope that here we will be able to establish and conduct a constructive dialogue and jointly seek ways to resolve topical problems."

TASS, Vatican Radio Sign Cooperation Accord

LD0604215990 Moscow TASS in English 1223 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Vatican April 6 TASS—The Soviet news agency TASS and Radio Vatican have signed an agreement on the supply of TASS English-language information to the Vatican radio station.

Voronin Receives Turkish State Minister Taner

LD1004141390 Moscow TASS in English 1336 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 10 TASS—Visiting Turkish Minister of State Gunes Taner was received by Soviet First Deputy Prime Minister Lev Voronin here on Monday.

The state and prospects of Soviet-Turkish trade and economic cooperation were discussed at the meeting, which took place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and goodwill.

Both sides reaffirmed their interest to see mutually-beneficial Soviet-Turkish cooperation developed and consolidated, both in its traditional forms and new areas, including co-production, joint ventures and Turkish firms' involvement in projects on Soviet territory.

Turkey's Taner Holds News Conference in Moscow

TA1004074790 Ankara Domestic Service in Turkish 2000 GMT 9 Apr 90

[Text] State Minister Gunes Taner is continuing his contacts in Moscow. According to an ANATOLIA AGENCY report, Taner first met with Konstantin Katushev, Soviet foreign economic relations minister.

Trade talks between the delegations of the countries have also begun. Working groups are discussing the promotion of trade relations, banking, the extension of loans, and contracting issues.

In a news conference he held in Moscow, Taner explained that the volume of trade between the two countries is very small compared to existing economic potentials. He added that Turkey is considering extending loans for consumer goods and projects to the Soviet Union.

He then inaugurated the Turkish export goods fair being held in Moscow. It is reported that 54 Turkish firms manufacturing textiles and spare parts are participating in the fair, which will last until 24 April.

Latin America & Caribbean

PRAVDA Views Cuban Economic Relationship

PM1004160590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Apr 90 Second Edition p5

[Special correspondent A. Sharyy undated Havana-Moscow dispatch: "Despite Having the Experience We Ship Not Only Achievements but Also Problems Across the Ocean"]

[Text] The Cuban economy is closely linked with the Soviet economy. It could not be any other way—in three decades of cooperation infrastructure industries have been created in Cuba, and now the country itself refines oil and builds machine tools, produces electronics, and manufactures agricultural machinery. Enterprises built with assistance from the Soviet Union smelt 95 percent of Cuba's steel, ensure the production of all its cane-harvesting combines, and assemble all its 100,000 television sets and 300,000 radio receivers per year. For its part the USSR meets from Cuban supplies one-third of its sugar requirements, 40 percent of its citrus fruit requirements, and 20 percent of its nickel and cobalt requirements.

The strong production links between our countries were also the reason why the economic mechanism in Cuba was shaped in accordance with a pattern well known to us from our own experience: rigid centralization of the planning and management of production and distribution and emphasis on moral incentives to working people. A corresponding model of economic cooperation was also developed whereby economic calculation was often replaced by political considerations. Now the times are demolishing this pattern.

The root of the problem lies in the present unfavorable currency and financial situation in the CEMA countries, and the imbalance in trade between the USSR and Cuba. Having shipped a consignment of equipment, for example, across the ocean, the Soviet Union receives in exchange only a bank account credit in transfer rubles, which are extremely difficult to spend. In addition, the difference cannot be made up from direct exchanges of goods with the Cubans since by established practice our Cuban partners settle not with individual suppliers but with the state as a whole.

"If Soviet enterprises have alternative opportunities they are not now interested in supplying Cuba," V. Zaykin, chief of the department for economic cooperation with the Republic of Cuba at the USSR International Economic Cooperation Bank, says.

There is the state order, of course: Like it or not, you will produce what you are told and dispatch it where you are told. But it is obvious that it is impossible to "compel" everyone—times have changed.

This year alone will see a reduction in deliveries of Soviet washing machines and refrigerators to Cuba. In a so-called "parallel" store in Havana (where goods in acutely short supply are sold at specially prescribed prices) I saw a Soviet "Chinar" refrigerator priced at 1,700 pesos—half a year's wages for the average Cuban. But even so Soviet goods do not stay unsold. So it is easy to see what imports from the USSR mean for Cuba.

Soviet specialists' extensive participation in tackling Cuban economic problems has also meant that we have shipped across the ocean not only our achievements but also our problems. Never-ending construction projects, obsolete design plans, laxness in fulfilling promises, disruptions in supplies, incompetent technical decisions, and a mania for mega-projects are as familiar at our projects in Cuba as they are at home.

What is the answer? Economists propose switching to world prices and abolishing the credits which are used to balance transactions, but that essentially disguise the deficiencies of the present economic mechanism. And, as is the case everywhere today, searching for economic methods to encourage cooperation. It is another matter that this search must be conducted by both interested parties and that measures must be agreed and adopted jointly. But there is simply no other way—it is time to get used to the fact that economic laws exist objectively and the price for neglecting them is high.

Of course, cooperation cannot be based on the interests of economically accountable enterprises alone. There are also state interests and class principles, but it is for organs of power to determine the specific amounts of credit and aid since it is impossible at this time to speedily manage without them in relations with Cuba.

This will obviously be discussed at the next session—the 20th—of the Soviet-Cuban Intergovernmental Commission on Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation, which will be held in Havana in mid-April.

At the height of last summer, on the eve of the 26 July revolutionary holiday, Havana was basically without bread for several weeks.

Wheat and rye do not grow in Cuba. The country imports grain from Canada and from European countries, and the grain is transported by ships chartered by the Soviet Union.

They transport it, and then... they stand idle at Cuban ports waiting to be unloaded. Last year it took 48 days, instead of 25, to unload the "Ima." The "Austro-Federico" spent 62 days, instead of the planned 39, in the ports of Cienfuegos and Santiago, while the "Sumadikha" spent an extra month at the wharves of Havana and Santiago.

The Soviet Union suffers losses in dollars. Cuba repays these losses in transfer rubles.

"The reason for the idle time is the slow unloading of ships," in the view of V. Vasyanovich, general representative of the USSR Ministry of the Maritime Fleet in Cuba. "A ship arrives in Havana from ,say, Vancouver, and then has to return and collect a new load—like a shuttle. But it stands too long in port, and does not complete the round trip on time. True, it must be said that last year the pace of unloading increased by nearly 20 percent, but this is not solving the problem."

"In general the unloading of Soviet ships in Cuba is satisfactory"—that is the opinion of Carlos Penaluer y Barral, operations director of the Cuban Maritime Port Union fleet. "There are, of course, difficulties arising from the poor availability of equipment at the ports, but last year's plans, under which the average intensiveness of unloading is 570 tonnes a day, were overfulfilled."

That does not make things any easier for their partners....

Steps to restructure relations are not always appropriately perceived by the partner. C. Penaluer complained that he had formerly had to deal only with the USSR Ministry of the Maritime Fleet, but now the shipping lines have become independent and it is necessary to discuss things with each one individually.

"I cannot say that the trouble is caused by differences in the shipping lines' interests," V. Vasyanovich says. "But it is obvious that none of the 13 shipping lines whose ships carry out shipments to Cuba have any economic interest at present."

[Sharyy] But what if they refuse to ship the freight?

[Vasyanovich] What then? The enterprises send the goods to the port, so where will it go? Terms have to be agreed at the stage of signing agreements.

[Sharyy] And does the shipping line have the right to express its opinion when the agreement is being concluded?

[Vasyanovich] Theoretically—yes. In practice, they will tell you: Take it! The problem should not be tackled within the framework of a single shipping line, or even the ministry, but on a countrywide scale. [Vasyanovich ends]

The situation regarding maritime shipments, when the "merchant" wastes efforts and resources and the "buyer" is left without the goods he so badly needs, is perhaps, regrettable as it may be, an authentic, if rather sharply focused, picture of our cooperation.

This year has brought new difficulties for the Cubans: The government has adopted a decision on additional measures to regulate consumption of certain basic food products, or in other words, on increasing prices and reducing distribution norms. One reason for this forced step is the difficulties with maritime shipments. Further confirmation of problems that were formerly concealed are coming to the surface, affecting both partners' interests.

Problems in Cuban Foreign Trade Examined

LD1104094190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 11 Apr 90

[Text] The session of the intergovernmental Soviet-Cuban commission on economic and technical cooperation will continue in Havana today. The commission will sum up the results of the work done over the year, and will discuss the quite real problems which have arisen. What kind of problems are these? Our correspondent in Havana reports.

[Viktor Gorbachev] In foreign trade, the volume of which has reached 8,500 million roubles, this means first and foremost the shortfall, which is painful for Cuba, in the supply of oil and oil products. For their part, the Cubans have not fulfilled obligations for citrus fruits and products processed by them. Difficulties have arisen in transport of goods between our countries. Because of the shortage of Soviet ships, it is necessary for Cuba to take upon itself part of the freighting. Considerable attention will be devoted to the work of enterprises built in Cuba with our aid. Because they are only slowly coming up to design capacity, the effectiveness of cooperation is suffering. The integrovernmental commission will also examine the issue of coordination of plans for the next two years. In this, mutual benefit will be one of the main criteria in assessing new projects and conditions for cooperation.

Cuba's Shipping Industry's Problems Noted

PM1004093990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Apr 90 Second Edition p 5

[Article by N.P. Tsakh, USSR deputy minister of the maritime fleet, under the general heading "At the Crossroads of Opinions: Aid to Other Countries": "Not Everything Is So Simple...."]

[Text] The press has now repeatedly mentioned how much the Republic of Cuba costs the Soviet Union each year, month, and day. In particular, it is pointless to emphasize again that, under intergovernmental agreements, the USSR purchases goods from Cuba at preferential prices which differ significantly from world prices.

Soviet-Cuban cooperation in the sphere of maritime shipping is wide-ranging. Soviet shipping lines annually transport around 24 million tonnes of reciprocal trade freight.

The work of USSR Ministry of the Maritime Fleet ships on the USSR-Cuba route is beset by a whole host of difficulties, chief among which is the insufficient capacity of Cuban ports. Furthermore, the USSR Ministry of the Maritime Fleet is experiencing a fleet shortage because of the intensive writing off of ships which have reached the end of their normative lifetime. These two basic reasons are leading to significant, unproductive idle time for Soviet ships at Cuban ports and to the need to charter foreign ships to deliver freight to Cuba.

In 1989 alone 30 percent of the total volume of freight was transported on chartered ships. The Ministry of the Maritime Fleet's losses amounted to around 34 million [currency not specified] in freely convertible currency.

The difficulties will probably continue until our countries switch to trading at world prices with payment for the value of goods and transport services in freely convertible currency.

Supreme Soviet

Parliament To Review Union Treaty 10 Apr

LD1004154390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Aleksandr Ruvinskiy report from the USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow on 10 April]

[Text] First of all, I would like to congratulate listeners of the First program and the Orbita channels who are listening to us now, on the adoption of the resolution on urgent measures to improve the lot of women, to protect mothers and children, and to strengthen the family. The measures just endorsed by the Supreme Soviet will enable the material position of almost six million families with children to be improved. This entails a considerable, almost a two-fold increase in benefits for looking after a child up to the age of 18 months, for the children of wives of servicemen in compulsory military service, and a number of other measures. The resolution will come into force on 1 January, 1991. The state is allocating more than R3 billion for the implementation of these measures, calculated for a period of one year.

However, adoption of this resolution is only a part of today's work at the Supreme Soviet. In a few minutes' time, the evening sitting will open, and in its second reading it will be hearing the draft USSR law on renewing the union treaty and delimiting the powers of the USSR and the union republics. Fourteen articles are to be examined and a resolution of some kind adopted. Let me remind you that this draft law is being examined in its second reading.

The members of the Supreme Soviet were today given materials here in the Kremlin, which are not directly related to today's sitting, but which I think are sufficiently important to be spoken about. The Committee of Glasnost has reached a conclusion. In its opinion, recordings and relays of the joint sessions of the chambers should be broadcast in full on radio and television. The point is that this was placed in doubt at the start of the present session by a number of deputies, and the committees were charged with studying this issue and all the material connected with it and with giving its verdict which was received today.

I would also like to mention one more document. This is the bulletin from the Commission of the Soviet of the Union for Transportation, Communications and Information Technology. The gist is that on 13 March this year, a meeting of delegations from the two republics of Armenia and Azerbaijan was held in the city of Tbilisi. It was recommended that the Commission for Transportation, Communications and Information Technology of the Soviet of the Union, along with people's deputies from both republics should take part in the work of this meeting and inform the Supreme Soviet of the results. It was this information that was put to the people's deputies today. It talks about the fact that, during a discussion of the situation that has come about, members of both delegations were united in that it is essential to make more concrete decisions at both the regional and republican levels on each of the issues that complicates the situation in the region. During the meeting, joint ventures of both Azerbaijan, Armenia, and the Ministry of Railways were worked out to ensure the normal functioning of railway transportation. In this way, it can be said that a start has been made toward restoring trust in relations between the republics.

I have to say that now, during the break in the session, a press conference has been held by Arkadiy Maslennikov, press secretary to the USSR president. It was devoted to yesterday's session of the Presidential Council. More of that, however, in the evening news program and our next report from the Kremlin will be on the First program at 1700.

Moscow TV Airs 10 Apr Supreme Soviet Session

Family Issues Viewed

LD1004155690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 10 April begins carrying a recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet session 10 April at the Kremlin in Moscow. The session is chaired by Anatoliy Lukyanov.

Lukyanov asks deputies to register; 421 members are present. The session is to consider measures to improve the lot of women, protect mothers and children, and strengthen the family.

At 1504 GMT Valentina Matviyenko, the chairperson of the women's committee which has prepared the draft law under consideration, takes the floor. She speaks about the heavy burdens that women have to bear in Soviet society and the need to increase maternity leave and various benefits to parents and guardians as well as payments to the wives of servicemen and widows of servicemen with children. The draft law envisages part-time work for mothers with children aged up to 14 years and allowances for more disabled children. Measures are to be taken to reduce the number of women with children compelled to work on night shifts. Matviyenko says that the norms of burdens carried by women need to be considered as the present norms are excessive and are not always observed. According to matviyenko, more money needs to be spent on maternity facilities. Many children die each year from hepatitis due to poor hygiene. She speaks about the excessively high number of abortions performed in the Soviet Union and the medical costs that ensue from them. However she says, too many issues must not be brought into this particular draft, some are covered by other pieces of legislation and it would be unrealistic to think that everything could be dealt with.

At 1534 GMT Lukyanov gives the floor to Voronin, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers. Voronin says that the government shares the concern of deputies about the protection of mothers and children and supports the initiatives of the women's committee. The draft was agreed by all departments of the Council of Ministers, he says. The measures agreed will not solve all problems, despite the fact that they represent a great increase in expenditure, especially in the sphere of the payment of special allowances. Voronin lists the areas where such increases are planned.

Financial Issues Discussed

LD1004163290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1543 GMT on 10 April continues carrying a recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet session 10 April at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Voronin continues his speech. He says working conditions should be improved for women. The new taxation system to be introduced with the planned market economy should provide appropriate incentives for the leaders of enterprises to achieve such improvements.

The question of finding extra finances for the improvements envisaged in the proposed draft is very complex. It has been decided to take the money from the remainder of the social insurance budget. In subsequent years they will be financed from the materal incentive of enterprises.

A number of measures could not be adopted due to insufficient finances or due to the fact that more work needed to be done on them. He requests, on behalf of the government, that they adopt the draft.

At 1552 GMT Lukyanov states that 37 people have requested permission to speak. He proposes that two hours be devoted to discussion; therefore, 25 people will be able to speak. He asks deputies to decide how they are to proceed.

An unidentified deputy says that only people with constructive proposals should be heard. Lukyanov agrees.

At 1555 GMT Valentina Ivanova Semenko from the Committee for Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order takes the floor. She proposes minor and detailed amendments to the wording of various points in the draft. She proposes measures to help families with many children.

At 1604 GMT the session adjourns for 15 minutes.

Children's Issues Receive Focus

LD1004171590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1618 GMT on 10 April continues carrying a recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet session 10 April at the Kremlin in Moscow.

As the session resumes, Lukyanov announces the next deputies to speak.

Deputy Yudin then takes the floor and says that there is insufficient legislation relating to young people and work; therefore the draft should contain proposals stating that such legislation will be adopted. He further states that the numbers of women requiring retraining as a result of freeing them from dangerous working conditions needs to be determined.

At 1623 GMT Deputy Marina Rakhmanova speaks on the necessity for family planning services to be set up in the Soviet Union, and cites the current financial costs of abortion to the country. She criticizes the lack of action taken to prevent the birth of many children with congenital diseases.

At 1628 GMT Deputy Bogdanov from the youth committee states that his committee completely supports the draft, but would like to make a number of remarks. He speaks of disabled and sick children who have suffered because of the conditions under which their mothers live and work. Education is lacking: Children are not trained for their future roles as mothers and fathers. Food and queues are a big problem which needs to be solved.

At 1634 GMT Deputy Soumova speaks about the fact that women are working under the most dangerous conditions, under which men cannot, for various reasons, work. What will happen if they are released from them? There are insufficient goods anyway. Women do not want to be without work. They must be gradually released from such working conditions.

At 1639 GMT Deputy Plekhanov says that 102 million rubles earned by the Children's Fund during the new year marathon is to be added to the allocations already in existence for carrying out the measures envisaged by the draft law. He speaks of other measures for helping children which are to be financed by the Children's Fund. He then complains about the fact that the Ministry of Health does not separately allocate any funds for pediatrics.

At 1648 GMT Deputy Bazarova speaks about the high rate of child mortality in Turkmenistan and lists the problems causing it. There are several regions in the republic, such as Tashauz Oblast and the area around the Aral Sea, where the ecological situation causes the figure to increase by 1.5-2 times more than in other oblasts of the republic. The problems are so urgent that the sources of funding are irrelevant.

At 1655 GMT Bazarova criticizes the fact that one parent families only receive 50 percent of the normal allowances.

Working Conditions for Women Viewed

LD1004180690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1656 GMT on 10 April continues carrying a recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet session 10 April at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Deputy Dudko speaks about the necessity for an index-linking mechanism related to allowances for mothers and children. She is worried about the lack of material provision for unmarried mothers. She goes on to mention that discussion is planned of measures to help children in Belorussia who suffered from Chernobyl.

At 1700 GMT an unidentified male speaker interjects.

At 1704 GMT Borodin, chairman of the Committee for Public Health, takes the floor and proposes some minor amendments to the draft law, including banning night work for women. A definition should be worked out of places where night work is permissible.

At 1707 GMT Barachenko, member of the Committee for Youth Affairs, proposes amendments regarding orphans and disabled children: Classifying categories should be revised. A law on the rights of the child should be drawn up. He proposes that the draft law be adopted without delay.

At 1711 GMT Lukyanov says that so far 10 out of the 37 speakers planned have spoken. A break is announced. When session resumes, Lukyanov says they have 45 minutes left, therefore nine speakers.

At 1714 GMT an Uzbek woman wants Bandalbayeva to be given the floor. A Bashkirian deputy interjects regarding voting by name.

At 1715 GMT Deputy Rogozhina wants paragraph 9 to be voted on separately, as it so important: She is afraid that women who are released from dirty jobs will be unemployed or will get worse jobs.

At 1718 GMT Deputy Rakhimova, Tajikistan, points out that over 200,000 people are unemployed there, 80 percent of them women. The recent troubles in Tajikistan were the result of poor social and economic conditions. The USSR Government is dragging its feet over creating new jobs. Night shift abolition has been achieved at Leninabad weaving combine, so night shift work can be abolished. She regrets that Biryukova, the only woman in the USSR Government, is not present here today. Cotton picking is also regarded now as a dangerous job, with all the chemicals and the dust, and it is mostly done by women.

At 1725 GMT Deputy Logunov makes a proposal to transfer women from a 8-hour work day to a 6-hour work day with retention of wages so that she can do highly-productive work. Also, husbands will be better looked after as a by-product.

At 1730 GMT Sukhoruchenkova, All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions secretary, says the draft law is a serious preparatory document for large-scale future tasks. There is over-employment of women in production. Over 200,000 women are now working overtime. Lower norms should be set for women. She proposes that rational job placement of pregnant women should be organized.

At 1735 GMT Deputy Magomedov from Dagestan recalls that measures to improve working conditions for women figured in many deputies' election platforms and proposes various detailed amendments to the draft law.

At 1741 GMT Lukyanov asks him if all his proposals have been submitted to the committee. Magomedov says he has.

At 1742 GMT Deputy Pukhova, head of the Soviet Women's Committee, speaks about the constitionally envisaged equality of women with men; however this is cosmetic. Most legal provisions to this effect are also not being fulfilled. Social problems are not being resolved by slogans. In connection with the introduction of financial autonomy, young women with children have proved unprofitable for bureauctrats. Women should have the right to choose, whether or not to have a family, or something else.

At 1748 GMT Deputy Zubkov, a gynecologist, describes the traumas which can occur to a baby while in the womb. Our progeny should be protected, he says: mothers should be given paid maternity leave of 12 weeks after the birth. Many countries give maternity leave for 28 weeks before the birth. He argues that the husband should be given time off to pick up the wife and baby from the maternity home.

Work, Living Standard Debated

LD1004185390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1754 GMT on 10 April continues carrying a recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet session 10 April at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Deputy Piryazeva proposes supporting Logunov's proposal for setting a six-hour working day for women and asks for a vote on it. She notes that the measures of the draft law will be mainly paid for by social insurance. She suggests stopping salary increases for top managers to help pay for these measures.

At 1758 GMT Deputy Shukshin, member of the Veterans' and Invalid's Committee, voices support on its behalf. Going about the business of this committee, Shukshin has seen conditions in orphanages for himself, and recognises the need for ameliorative measures. He proposes that the procuracy be charged with providing every child coming out of an orphanage with accommodation.

At 1802 GMT Deputy Badalbayeva speaks for Uzbek deputies in support of the draft law. Zones with especially high infant mortality should be incorporated into the draft law. With the high level of female unemployment in Uzbekistan, 20,000 women work at home and another 7,000 would like to, but there are no sewing machines.

At 1806 GMT Lukyanov notes that 20 deputies have spoken, but 40 have registered to speak, and then lists them. He appeals to the hall as to what to do and puts it to the vote. 368 vote for ceasing debate, 15 against, and 4 abstain.

At 1808 GMT Matviyenko returns to the rostrum and thanks the hall for its constructive discussion. Many of the proposals need to be studied by legal experts before they can be incorporated. She apologizes for not being able to answer every question individually. There have been many questions on paragraph 8, granting part-time work to mothers of children up to 14 years old, instead of eight years old, as is presently the case. Matviyenko does not feel that this measure will complicate the work of production administrations, which can simply hire the requisite extra labor needed to fill the void left by mothers of children up to 14 years old. Unfortunately, the present standard of living will not permit many mothers to use this right.

At 1814 GMT Matviyenko says she has received a question on what is being done in her commission on the expansion of pornographic videos. She replies that there is a criminal penalty of up to three years' imprisonment, but unfortunately it is not being applied. She agrees that measures must be taken.

She says that Deputy Uralov's proposal of subsidized housing for young people deserves attention.

Matviyenko says that Semenko made many constructive proposals, many of which have already been envisaged in another draft law which will be discussed at a later date. Deputy Borodin suggested putting hard currency into orphanages, and Matviyenko agrees with this. Corresponding orders are being given to define areas where women may work night shifts if absolutely necessary. Rogozhina proposed making a list of jobs which should be illegal for women up to 30 years' old, and Matviyenko approves this approach.

At 1822 GMT Matviyenko admits that maternity allowance of half the minimum wage is little, but is a start. She agrees with Rogozhina's suggestion of a minimum wage for single parent families who were themselves orphans.

At 1824 GMT for the Council of Ministers Voronin emphasizes the urgency of this draft law. He reminds the hall that there is not enough money for all the causes which people would like to support. He recommends that the draft law be adopted in the form in which it is proposed, with a few editorial amendments.

At 1829 GMT Lukyanov wants to put the draft law to the vote, but Deputy Safarov interrupts from the floor and is in turn interrupted by Lukyanov. Matviyenko reminds the hall from the floor that the employment of children in tobacco fields is already banned by law, and that the banning of children from working in cotton fields is today simply unrealistic and would not work.

At 1832 GMT an unidentified deputy asks for Rogozhina's proposal to be put to a separate vote.

At 1833 GMT Deputy Medikov points out that the standard of living is different in various regions, and therefore the allowances should be differentiated. Matviyenko admits that local living standards are not incorporated in the allowances. Piryazeva made a remark on these coefficients. Voronin says that the draft law should be adopted in the form proposed, which can be realistically carried out.

Amendments Voted on

LD1004195490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1836 GMT on 10 April continues carrying a recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet session 10 April at the Kremlin in Moscow.

A deputy from the floor proposes buying equipment for babies with hard currency. Matviyenko responds that a decision has already been made on resuscitation purchasing equipment.

At 1838 GMT a woman deputy urges Lukyanov to get on with the vote.

At 1839 GMT another deputy suggests taxing public organizations, such as the CPSU. He also suggests that PRAVDA has some kopecks to spare for funding these social provisions. Lukyanov says that this is not a very constructive approach, and asks for proposals to be kept within certain limits.

At 1840 GMT a Central Asian deputy suggests that women working in 40-degree centigrade temperatures should also get an allowance for this.

At 1842 GMT Voronin responds to the critical deputy, saying that the construction of dachas for military personnel has ceased and just over one million rubles has been spent on this. Voronin claims that more than six months have been spent on this draft law and again pleads with the hall to adopt it.

At 1844 GMT Lukyanov appeals to the hall on whether a vote can be taken.

At 1845 GMT anonymous voting is adopted. Lukyanov is sure that Soviet women will trust the male deputies. Nevertheless, at 1847 GMT, a roll call vote takes place. 407 are for, 1 is against, and 2 abstain. Lukyanov says that this result reflects pluralism. Lukyanov then asks for a vote on the Peryazeva amendment on sources of funding. This ballot is anonymous. 131 are for, 200 against, and 57 abstain.

At 1850 GMT Rogazhina's proposal that certain jobs not be given to women under 30 is commented on by Matviyenko. She agrees with the proposal, but says that the amendment cannot be prepared in time. Rogozhina's proposal is supported by an unidentified deputy. Lukyanov asks whether an instruction to the government on this amendment would suffice. Rogozhina agrees. Matviyenko reads out the instruction to the government.

At 1854 GMT voting takes place on Rogazhina's proposal. 181 are for, 165 against, and 33 abstain. The amendment is rejected because the majority in favor is insufficient.

At 1855 GMT Lukyanov declares a break.

An announcer says that discussions of a conceptual character took place. Bisher, Advadze, Moshnyaga, Kugultiyev, Shcherbak, Degetyan, Ryabchenko, Nishanov, Akhromeyev, Burlatskiy, Medvedev, Blokhin, Rakhmadjiyev, and others spoke.

At 1858 GMT Deputy Yakovlev speaks on amendments to production courts in the context of juridical norms, a copy of which has been distributed to the deputies.

At 1902 GMT Lukyanov explains that the amendments provide for a defense counsel to be present at an early stage after the accusation of a suspect.

At 1904 GMT Yakovlev notes an amendment from the floor. Ignatovich, an investigator, asks how many lawyers and prosecutors there are in the country to implement this law. Yakovlev answers that it can be done. The deputy counters that the number of suspects is increasing. He wants to know what this will cost the state. Yakovlev refers him to the Justice Ministry. The Union of Advocates claims that the number of lawyers is sufficient to implement the law and will not tax state resources unduly. The deputy is unsatisfied and asks for a further comment later.

At 1908 GMT Yakovlev explains to a deputy that lawyers must be on duty to act as defense counsel. Ignatovich, having reached the rostrum, claims that the state budget will have to provide from one to ten million rubles to finance the law. He regrets that this issue has arisen at the end of the day when everyone wants to go home, and advises the deputies to reject the law.

Yokovlev replies that costs will be saved in the actual court case itself, since the lawyers will be reimbursed from court costs.

At 1912 GMT voting takes place for an amendment by Deputy Zilinskiy. 342 are for, 17 against, and 17 abstain. Lukyanov asks deputies to show some respect and not to go home yet.

At 1914 GMT the session adjourns.

Further Reporting on 10 Apr Parliament Session

Voronin Speaks on Role of Women

LD1004101690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0830 GMT on 10 April, in its "Vremya" newscast, broadcasts a two-minute report by correspondent A. Gerasimov on today's Supreme Soviet session.

Gerasimov says that deputy Matviyenko spoke on behalf of the Committee on Affairs of Women, Family Care, Motherhood, and Children, which is sponsoring a decision on the lot of women, Gerasimov adds: "The draft of the decision sets out urgent measures to tackle the most acute problems of protecting the family and children, safeguarding the work rights of teenagers and women, and the health of the mother and child. The draft devotes great attention to raising the standard of family life during the period around the birth of a child. It is proposed that child allowance up to the age of 18 months should be raised from 35 rubles to the minimum wage level. Some R2,500 million will be needed annually to cover this. It is also intended that nonworking mothers and the families of servicemen on compulsory military service should be paid the same allowance. The decision proposes whole package of measures to provide proper protection for all groups of the population who in one way or another are socially vulnerable.

On behalf of the government, Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, reported on where the money would come from. Then the deputies started debating the decision.

Resolution on Family Care Adopted

LD1004114890 Moscow TASS in English 1121 GMT 10 Apr 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow April 10 TASS—The Soviet parliament today adopted a resolution on urgent measures to improve the status of women, increase mother and child care and strengthen the family.

Last week President Gorbachev in his message to parliament, stressed the urgency of this issue and called on deputies to examine it as soon as possible.

Over three billion roubles and 400 million currency roubles will be allocated to fulfil this programme. Measures to improve the living standards of six million families will include an increase of the monthly child care allowance up to the age of 18 months from 35-50 roubles to 70, the introduction of a similar allowance for non-working women and an increase of allowance on children in state or private care.

If twins or triplets are born, the allowance will be paid for each child (now it is paid for only one). Women with children under fourteen may have a partial working day or working week at their request.

The money for the programme will be mainly allocated from the state budget, Soviet First Deputy Prime Minister Lev Voronin told parliament.

However, its implementation will postpone an increase of salaries of some categories of higher educational establishment employees and wages of those working in northern and remote areas.

Law To Protect President Urged

PM1104134590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Parliamentary correspondent A. Stepovoy report on 10 April USSR Supreme Soviet Session: "All Power to the Soviets!"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted]

On Defending the Honor and Dignity of the USSR President

The speech by Deputy V.K. Foteyev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals, was not down on the agenda. But it was necessitated by the course of the events of recent (and not only recent) days, when a number of public statements and some press organs have included extremely disrespectful statements, to say the least, about the Soviet state's top official.

In his speech Deputy V.K. Foteyev said: Slanderous fabrications about the the USSR president are being spread and attacks are being made on the USSR Constitution. You would think that we should proceed on the premise that the USSR president and the USSR Constitution are a kind of embodiment of the solidity and immutability of the fundamental pillars and moral values of the USSR. I am profoundly convinced that respect for them as the symbol of our statehood means respect for Soviet power and respect for ourselves. Therefore, after a broad exchange of opinions, the Committee on Questions of Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals has come to the Supreme Soviet with a legislative initiative on the question of defending the honor and dignity of the USSR president. The authority of the Constitution and the president must be protected not only by an understanding of their lofty purpose but also by the force of law. Legislation in a whole number of countries makes provision for measures of this kind, it must be observed.

After a short but constructive exchange of views a two-point parliamentary decision was put to the vote. The first point provides for the inclusion of this question on the session agenda and its examination under special procedure. The second instructs the Committee for Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals and the legislation committee [Committee for Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order] to prepare a draft law on the defense of the honor and dignity of the USSR president and submit it for examination by parliament. Here it was stipulated that, since Deputy V.K. Foteyev defined the topic in somewhat broader terms in his speech, these committees are to also be tasked with preparing a question on the defense of the USSR Constitution and submitting it for examination by the Supreme Soviet. In a vote 286 deputies voted for this decision, 46 voted against, and 53 abstained. [passage omitted]

Political & Social

Politburo Appeals for Consolidating Ranks

PM1104091590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian Second Edition 11 Apr 90 p 1

[Unattributed report: "At the CPSU Central Committee Politburo"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee Politburo has examined questions connected with the progress of the pre-congress debate and the discussion of the draft platform of the CPSU Central Committee for the 28th Party Congress and the draft CPSU regulations. It was noted that the debates in the party and in society are going on in a lively and productive manner. The comparison of various opinions on a broad circle of problems produced rich and varied material for enriching these party documents. At the same time many communists and party organizations are expressing serious concern at the fact that some members of the CPSU are making persistent attempts to divert the debate from a constructive channel onto the road of factional struggle and to provoke a split in the party. The need has arisen to make an assessment of such attempts and to appeal for the consolidation of the party ranks.

By agreement with members of the CPSU Central Committee, with candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee, with members of the Central Auditing Commission, taking into account the opinion of secretaries of the central committees of the union republics, kray committees and oblast committees of the party, an open letter from the CPSU Central Committee to the communists of the country was composed, called "For Consolidation on a Foundation of Principle," which will be published in the press.

CPSU Letter to Communists on Upcoming Congress

PM1104091790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian Second Edition 11 Apr 90 p 1

["Text" of an open letter to the country's communists from the CPSU Central Committee entitled: "For Consolidation on a Principled Basis"]

[Text] Comrade communists, we are moved to address this letter to you by the complicated and contradictory processes in society and the party on the eve of the 28th CPSU Congress. The deep changes taking place in the country and the acute nature of the problems facing the country give the congress particular importance. And much depends on how our party forum is prepared and on what mood, ideological luggage, and political assets the communists bring to it.

At present, in party organizations and in the press pre-congress debates are growing in strength and are based on the draft platform prepared by the Central Committee for the 28th Party Congress and its new rules. A decisive break away from the authoritarian, bureaucratic system, an orientation on humane and democratic socialism, an efficient plan-market economy, a law-based state, on the renewal of the Soviet Federation, on the creation of worthy living conditions for the people, a new foreign policy permitting the Cold War to be ended and a start to be made to switching resources to the benefit of the country—these articles of the draft platform of the CPSU Central Committee which express the essence of perestroyka are a good foundation for consolidating the party and the people.

In the course of broad and free discussion, both support and criticism of the drafts are being expressed, acutely at times, corrections, additions, and clarifications are being proposed and alternative variants are being put forward. Intensive work is going ahead to summarize and analyze everything that could serve to enrich the platform and the rules of the CPSU. The debate expresses the multifarious nature of the views and positions existing in the party and in society, reveals the concern of people at the tension in the social and political sphere, the crisis phenomena in the economy, conflicts on interethnic grounds, separatist tendencies, the growth in crime, the weakening of discipline and order.

In conditions of glasnost, democracy and freedom of opinions, it has become quite normal for there to exist a broad spectrum of political views and positions in our country. The CPSU, which has given up having its leading role enshrined in legislation, has shown by its deeds that it comes out for open and honest competition of ideas. At the same time, the Central Committee considers it impossible to pass over the attempts being made by certain people to lead the party away from the strategic course it has adopted and if this does not succeed then to provoke a split in it. This is being done both from the right and the left. Some people reject perestroyka, regarding it as a "liberal-bourgeois degeneration" of society and the party. Others, allying themselves with antisocialist forces, declare the October Revolution to have been a tragic mistake and call for the restoration of capitalism.

Nationalist and chauvinistic feeling and separatist aspirations represent a serious danger. All of this finds a certain reflection in the party, too. Communists note rightly that conservatism, dogmatism in thought and action, and the inability to conduct a dialogue with people, to hear and understand them and to move to meet them remain in many party structures. All of this results in not inconsiderable losses for the party. Failure to take account of presentday trends in the development of society and of the growing need for genuine democracy, glasnost, and priority attention to the person to be asserted in reality means to find oneself on the edge of political life. The irrevocable rejection of the legacy of Stalinism and stagnation is vitally necessary for the CPSU.

No less concern is evoked by the fact that a number of members of the CPSU have unfurled a struggle against the party from pseudo radical positions under the flag of perestroyka. Declaring themselves to be "consistent democrats," virtually the only champions of radical changes, they have carried out an attack upon the ideological and organizational foundations of the CPSU, and some of them have taken up arms directly against Lenin and Leninism. In this connection, attention is drawn to the activity of individuals who have united themselves around the so-called Democratic platform. Let us recall that the draft of the CPSU Central Committee contains an invitation to make proposals that go so far as alternative drafts, and of course there is nothing reprehensible in the fact that a group of party members has set out its views. Moreover one can understand the serious concern expresed in the text of the Democratic platform about the situation in society and in the party and the desire to change it decisively and many are impressed by the sharply critical character of the document.

However, the Democratic platform essentially does not contain any serious attempt to make a constructive contribution to the working out of the party's strategy and tactics. It lacks answers to the questions of principle which disturb our society today, and specific proposals in the field of the economy, the social sphere, interethnic relations, and foreign political activity.

But behind the sharpness of the assessments of the past and present and the garish slogans dictated at first sight by a desire to impart a more radical character to perestroyka, there hides the design of the authors of the Democratic platform to turn our party into some kind of shapeless association with complete freedom for factions and groups, that is, practically speaking, to dismantle it. And wide propaganda and organizational activity has been unfolded in this direction. Supporters are being registered. Coordinating councils and centers have been set up in some regions. Emissaries are being sent out to the localities. The issue has been raised of forming a material base independent of the CPSU. This is a course towards splitting of the CPSU from within, towards removing it from the political arena.

Although to impose a federalist structure upon the party and to separate communists on the basis of nationality lead essentially to the same consequences.

We are categorically against the splitting of the party. We are for consolidation of party ranks. Differences in understanding of particular problems and in implementation of the tasks of perestroyka, if they do not deny the ideological-theoretical and organizational foundations of the party, can and should be the subject of all-round discussion, but certainly not a reason for the splitting of the party. Each communist has every opportunity for active participation in the pre-congress debate, for the expression, upholding, and putting into effect of his views. The draft platform and rules of the CPSU are open for any proposals and addenda. Only by means of rational synthesis of different opinions in the framework of socialist choice is it possible to create a single platform of communists determining the future of the party and the country.

The CPSU Central Committee draws the attention of party organizations to the need for the invigoration of the whole pre-congress debate, for its close linkage with the processes of renewal of society, with practical deeds. A bold comparison should be made of the various approaches, a solicitous attitude should be taken to each constructive idea, and at the same time compromise should not be permitted toward ideological vacilation and ideological indiscrimination. Communists should not allow themselves to be carried away with loud phrases and easy promises behind which there is nothing but personal political ambition.

The time has come when, while not giving up freedom of discussion and while strengthening its constructive basis, it is essential to get to the bottom of the question of what is to be done with those members of the party who insistently and purposefully lead matters towards a split, who create within the ranks of the CPSU factions with organizational structures, who deny the socialist choice of the Soviet people, and who by their views and conduct have in effect placed themselves outside the party. Is it possible for such people to remain within the ranks of the CPSU? This question has been raised by the logic of political development and it should be decided by communists, party organizations, and their committees.

Drawing the line between those who have entered upon the path of struggle against the party is not a purge and not a repression of dissent. It should be directed against those who organize factional groups. As to those communists who have been carried away by pseudorevolutionary phrases and have been unable to understand properly the processes taking place in society and in the party, here one thing is necessary—the strengthening of explanatory work capable of convincing both those who have been misled and those who are vacillating of the correctness of the party's policy.

Less than three months remain until the 28th CPSU Congress. Report backs and elections are beginning in many party organizations, as well as the nomination of candidates to conferences and to the all-party forum. It is important that convinced communists, people with initiative, creative people who are morally irreproachable with a heightened sense of responsibility to the party, their people, and our socialist homeland for the fate of the revolutionary renewal of society. We are in favor of the consolidation of the party ranks on a principled basis, of the firm unity of all who cherish the aims of perestroyka and the ideals of a humane and democratic socialism.

We are in favor of the 28th Congress of the CPSU becoming a congress of renewal and creativity, of the acquisition of new strength and new energy by the party.

Reportage on 21st Komsomol Congress

Gorbachev Attends Opening

LD1104070890 Moscow TASS in English 0653 GMT 11 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 11 TASS—By TASS special correspondent:

A Soviet Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] congress opened here today to hear a progress report by its Central Committee and discuss a new programme and rules.

President Mikhail Gorbachev, Parliament Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov, Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov, and other Communist Party and government leaders are attending, along with the 2,000 or so official delegates.

Meeting delegates on Tuesday, Gorbachev described the situation in the Soviet Union as a watershed. He said perestroyka is effectively the nation's second revolution this century.

This, he stressed, requires the rallying of all healthy forces in society, and the party offers the broad-based platform for such unity.

Gorbachev voiced confidence that the 30 million strong Komsomol would continue to March hand in hand with the party.

Gorbachev Addresses Congress

LD1004131190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, USSR president and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the delegates of the 21st Komsomol Congress at the Rossiya Hotel's Central State Concert Hall in Moscow, 10 April—recorded]

[Text] I in turn cordially welcome you, delegates of the 21st Komsomol Congress, and I want to wish you success in your work in Komsomol affairs. Nevertheless, I put my wishes for the success of the congress first. We consider that it will indeed be a success, and I think that not only you need it, but Communist Party members and the entire country need it, for we are speaking of our younger generation, of the youth movement and its role, and naturally of the fate of the political youth movement which is the Komsomol.

I sat in the first row with boys from Kazakhstan, and wondered with them what I should speak to you about. I walk about the foyer and see how all kinds of concepts and theses can be heard. I look here, and it is about democratic socialism—it seems that everything is clear, but nevertheless it is talk about the present time, about the present time and about us in the context of this time, about all of us. So perhaps there will be several themes in my address—it is not a report—and the rest is up to you. Afterwards you can ask about the things that interest you in any form, and as far as I am able to satisfy your interest, I will try to answer.

The first thing I thought of when I was making notes for myself yesterday to jog my memory was a sort of association for my address to you, for it has turned out that the Komsomol Congress, the 21st Komsomol Congress, is taking place on the eve of the 120th anniversary of the birth of Vladimir Ilich Lenin. We are separated by six and a half decades from the age of Lenin, who headed the construction of socialism in our huge country. These decades have been filled with dramatic events, in which radical breakthroughs and breakdowns on the road to the future were interwoven, with both terrible recoils and tremendous upsurges of the people's initiative. These same decades found room for both the deadening spirit of totalitarianism, and for the thunderclap of victories, of real, genuine, and very great victories by our people.

And the bitterness of irredeemable losses and lost opportunities—there they are, six and a half decades. The contradictions engendered by our history also permeate the life of Soviet society today. We seek ways out of them through revolutionary perestroyka. How can Lenin help us today? What can we and should we learn from him? Of course, this is a big topic. Now this topic is being developed in the press, and I welcome this, and I think that these are responsible comrades who are developing this discussion on Lenin's legacy, on Lenin, on our revolution, and on the fate of the world's first socialist state—all of this is very important to you and me.

We must frankly admit that the past decades have, to a certain extent, formed a simplified image of Lenin in our minds: of a theorist who knew the answers to all the questions of life; a politician who almost headlong advanced toward a goal set and determined once and for all. As a rule, the dialectical flexibility of Lenin's mind, of Lenin's tactics, and his aversion for dogmatism and ultra-left libertarianism, for adventurism and unthinking onslaughts, remained outside the field of vision, without profound analysis.

The spirit of Leninism lies not in violence but in creation. Lenin bequeathed us the idea of civil peace and not civil war, consolidation and not alienation, and the free development of the people's life. He dreamed of as many as possible, and then absolutely all, of the working people participating in the building of a new life. Socialism as the living and free work of people of labor—this, comrades, is the main thing in Leninism.

Today, our country and society need nothing more than the free, voluntary, and comradely unity of people and peoples, the acquisition of the feeling of a united family, the revival and increase of the moral potential engendered by the October Revolution.

The CPSU proposes a wide platform of such unity, the platform of humane and democratic socialism. The party calls on all healthy forces of society, who genuinely hold dear the fundamental interests of the people, to rally on that platform. The real Lenin is astonishingly modern: and do not believe those who say the contrary. Do not believe them! Try to ascertain for yourselves what I am saying here. In the very contradictions of perestroyka, in its ebbs and flows, Lenin's idea of the need for a radical change of the entire point of view of socialism shines out increasingly clearly. We must really go deeply into the idea of Lenin's works, especially in the last years of his life, when Lenin was devoting intense and even tormented thought to the paths of our revolution.

In 1983, I was entrusted with delivering Lenin's anniversary report. I wondered then what to talk about in that report. Every year a report dedicated to the anniversary is read. I had the idea of returning to those works, Lenin's last works. It was just 60 years since they had come out, and I could sense the feelings of concern, and profound concern at that, of our Ilich, the leader of the socialist revolution, for the destiny of the revolution and the destiny of the state. First and foremost, I think, we need to make a profound study of Lenin's ideas about socialism as a society of people of labor, about socialism as a democratic order, as the creation of the masses; about the power of the soviets, about refashioning the management apparatus, about self-management of the working people, and about centrism which guarantees the unity of the activities of labor collectives; and about the multistructural nature of a transitional economy and the diversity of the forms of ownership in it, about the system of civilized members of cooperatives, about the plan and the market; about keeping strict accounts, and thrift; about nations under socialism; about a federation of sovereign Soviet repubics; about the equality of people of all nations and ethnic groups; about knowing how to live in a multinational country; about possessing all the wealth of culture which mankind has created, and about enhancing culture when progressing to socialism; about a party which is not waging war, but which is creative, about a party without which working people and everything that reasons in society cannot unite in positive labor.

The most valuable thing in Leninism is his art of the dialectic, his ability to take into account the most complex features of a transitional revolutionary epoch; and to understand how to use both the objective and the subjective factors and the motivating forces of that epoch.

I invite you to realize the unique wealth of the ideas and experience of Lenin's legacy. Now, to get back to your congress. I was thinking about this yesterday, and to a certain extent the delegates to the 21st Komsomol Congress have a task to resolve that is of as much importance as what faced the young men and women who gathered in Moscow for the first congress of their organization, and who laid the foundations of the Communist Union of Young People. Back then, too, there was enormous ferment, very heated discussion indeed on this score. The most prominent representatives of the party took part, and together with the young people, they sought an answer to the question of what sort of youth movement it should be. This was determined by Ilich's speech on the tasks of the Union of Young People. It was then that the Komsomol's basic outlook on the world was laid down, and the main thrusts of its activity chosen. Today, above all else, it is important to ask yourselves honestly whether this goal remains as significant as ever, and what sailing directions your organization will use to chart the way ahead.

Already people in the hall here are asking me to tell the Komsomol what it should be like. I am forever restraining myself from constantly providing remedies from the sidelines. Even from sidelines that root for you, that worry about and share all that the Komsomol has worried about in the past few years since its 20th Komsomol Congress, and in the years of perestroyka.

Where and how should matters proceed? I pose this problem in all its trenchancy. Incidentally, this is not just a question for you. This question will be at the focus of attention of the 28th party congress, too. The whole of our society is tackling it today, and generally speaking, when all is said and done, each and every Soviet person must resolve it for himself. You have come here after heated debates, armed with the mandates of your comrades. I am quite sure that some delegates will already have decided what stance to adopt. Others will still be casting around. What is it that I would like to say in response to that main question of where now?

One might say that after five years we now live in a different and greatly changed society. Democratization and glasnost have emancipated people, and have given them the opportunity to express their opinions freely on topical matters of society's life. In the press, at assemblies and rallies, in lecture halls, and in conversation diamemtrically opposed points of view come into fierce and sometimes uncompromising conflict. The spread of opinions is unusually broad in the search for the answer to this, the main question. Comrades, we must understand this, so as to avoid being overwhelmed with confusion.

This is a very difficult situation that we have all ended up in. But then, that is always the case when a society finds itself at a crossroads, and undergoing revolutionary upheaval. To avoid being nonplussed in these circumstances, and to avoid being mistaken in our choice of path, we must first and foremost understand the sense of the times; grasp the dominant, the fundamental trend that is guiding the course of events. Then, later on, using this point of departure it will be easier to seek and to find the answers to many other specific questions that every day hem us in from all directions.

To my mind, one could think up no better or briefer definition of the current moment, the stage through which our society is now passing, than that of a turning point. It is clear to all of us here in the country, and in the world, that Soviet society is in the process of transition from one state to another, namely at a turning point. But the actual turning point has different dimensions, depending upon the scale and standard we adopt for assessing the present. For if one listens today in the republics, in collectives, in lecture halls, and on the street one can hear and apprehend a great deal about anxiety. And this is indeed the case.

If one takes a historical approach to assessing events, then we should say that in our country the second revolution of this century is unfolding. Five years ago, when we embarked on this path, it was not only people of the older generation, but also thinking young people, who sensed and perceived that there was a great deal in our country that had gone wrong, and that one could not keep on living like that. A profound abyss had emerged between the lofty principles proclaimed and what actually happened in life.

The country was losing its positions at a catastrophic speed, rolling backwards according to literally all the main indices of progress. To halt the growth of crisis phenomena and as far as possible to speed up the development of the economy, science, and technology: This was in fact how we saw the task initially, and how it was posed by the party. But the further we were drawn into this process, the better we understood the sick state of our society, and the clearer it became that it was impossible to limit ourselves to darning individual holes, and the clearer it became that a radical renewal of all elements of the social organism was essential.

It is from these reflections that the concept of perestroyka was gradually born. Perestroyka is counted as dating from the April 1985 plenum of the Central Committee. That is correct. The roots of that policy, the policy of perestroyka, however, lie in the demands of the time, the behest of the time, in the need for changes which was dictated by the logic of life itself.

[Text] The years that have passed since then have encompassed events such as the 27th party congress, the 19th party conference, Central Committee plenums on cardinal issues of policy and the life of society, the first free elections in many decades, three congresses of USSR People's Deputies, and sessions of the Supreme Soviet of the new convocation, at which fundamental laws have been adopted on ownership, land, leasing, and much else. The elections in the republics and the local elections that took place recently complete the formation of a renewed structure of Soviet power. The legal foundations for transforming the country's national-state structure on new and truly federative principles are being created. We have every ground to measure the results of perestroyka by the radical changes that have taken place in recent years in international relations as well.

Thanks first and foremost to our new foreign policy, an end to the cold war has come. The world has been brought back from the verge of nuclear conflict and a real process of disarmament has begun. Evidently, the withdrawal of the troops, our troops, from Afghanistan has been particularly tangible in a direct way for many

Soviet people. This, too, is one of the direct ways that our country entered into perestroyka.

If one takes in at a single look everything that we are all witness to and direct participants in, one can say that perhaps the greatest watershed of world revolution, of world history, fell to the 1989s. In essence, we can say that a new era is being born, one promising immense opportunities for our people and for all of mankind. I have already had occasion to say it more than once, but I consider it important to repeat here at this meeting with delegates to the Komosmol congress the idea that I have expressed before, that whatever complex questions we have tackled or had to tackle, however difficult and at times dramatic the circumstances we have run into, we must not forget this historic scale of the cause the party and the people have embarked on.

Otherwise one may lose one's orientation under pressure from the situation, from the disorganization of our life, and from the shortages and concerns.

There are no grounds for doubting that the policy of perestroyka is correct, even for a moment. We need this policy; it has been achieved through suffering. This choice has not simply been justified; it is vitally necessary for our country. This is the main statement from which we should proceed in all of our activity. For this reason, the answer to all questions must be sought not by returning to the past, but by moving forward; not by renouncing the policy of perestroyka, but by deepening that policy of perestroyka and implementing it more consistently and resolutely.

I am saying this because there are already pieces of advice in both the former and latter cases. Some people are holding us back, while others rush ahead at breakneck speed, discarding everything, and without having any idea where they are headed. We must be consistent, cautious, and firm in implementing our policy. It is all the more important to remember this since we are now at the most difficult stage of the perestroyka process. Grave disruptions of supplies, the exacerbation of socioeconomic problems as a whole, strikes that flare up from time to time on this footing, conflicts on an ethnic basis, separatist and centrifugal trends, the elemental mass-meeting movement in which all sorts of antisocialist ideas are whipped up alongside healthy initiatives, the growth of crime, a decrease in the standard of public morality—these are all realities of our life today. These are our times, too, but now seen large-scale, from close up. We should not simply live through them or wait for everything to sort itself out, as it were, and take a turn for the better. We must exert all efforts to more swiftly overcome the crisis situation and to sail the ship of our state out into open waters. This will not take place without you, dear friends. Our Komsomol and all Soviet young people—the country's young men and women—can and must play an immense role in all this.

Wherein lies the dramatic nature of the moment we are living through? The country finds itself, as it were, at the watershed of this transition from one condition to another, about which I have spoken.

Indeed, one can say that in our economy there is a real interregnum. The command system is no longer working, but the new one, based on the use of economic levers, the stimulation of people's involvement in the results of their labor, and the revelation of a person's full creative possibilities has not yet come fully into its own.

It is the same in the political sphere. In accordance with its new role as the political vanguard, the party is already giving up—and has to a significant extent given up—its day to day management of the economy and its tackling of other practical questions of state life. However, the new soviets are still only just getting onto their feet, and have not yet fully mastered their competences, nor have they yet put together the essential authoritative apparatus that has to take on the concerns that used to be borne by the party and the party apparatus. That's to say they are on the move; they have left one but not yet arrived at the other. They have gone out of one system, but not yet entered the other. Now the essential legal basis exists. I mean the law adopted yesterday by the Supreme Soviet about local economy and self-government.

In essence, there is now this transitional state in practically all spheres of public activity. This applies to the party itself, which is continuing to be the driving force of the perestroyka process, while at the same time needing to restructure itself, and doing so decisively. Otherwise it is threatened by the risk that it will be crowded out of its vanguard position.

The main thing we have is the platform defining the basic parameters of the path we have chosen, the aims and tasks of perestroyka as a social process, and the role of the party itself in a socialist society in renewal. Of course, both the platform and the new draft charter that have been put forward for discussion by communists and all people are not encountering a clear-cut attitude. Many additions, remarks, and well-founded criticisms are being expressed. All these will be both summarized and taken into account in the proper way when these documents are worked on and when they are discussed at the party congress itself.

At the same time, we have come up against attempts to deflect the party from the path it has chosen—the threat of schism. On the one hand, a conservative tendency has formed, which is afraid of deepening the perestroyka process, or even calls directly for a retreat to the form of life that arose right back under Stalin, and which has hardly changed in the last decades, or has even in some ways worsened. To move backward would be fatal. It would deprive the country for many decades to come of any chance for rebirth, and would doom it to vegetate. I am not talking about the fact that a return to the previous order would certainly be accompanied—I am deeply convinced of this—with inescapable features:

repressions, injustice, countless victims, and preservation of poverty. We need to see this, what different things could lead to, to take up a position, a civic, firm position.

I am convinced that our people—our young people first and foremost—will reject out of hand any attempt to return the country to the past and to do away with the freedom we have acquired. On the other hand, society is being invited to reject socialist principles: Essentially, to acknowledge as wrong the whole of the path it has traversed since October 1917. That would mean jeopardizing those social gains that are an important and positive part of our historical experience, and leaving the trunk road of social development. For many socialist ideas and values have already become, and are more and more becoming, norms in the life of all mankind in the run-up to the 21st century.

Without our positive experience, today's civilization would be totally different. Totally different; that is generally accepted.

It would also mean betraying the memory of the older generations of Soviet people, who, in terrible conditions, struggled to industrialize the country and to create modern science and technology; who shouldered all the privations of war and triumphed to bring freedom to the people of Europe.

You might say: What danger can there be in people preaching their views? Even if they are extreme conservative, or ultra-leftwing views. True enough, we view glasnost and a plurality of views as mandatory elements in the democracy that is taking root in the country thanks to perestroyka. Of course, this presupposes the opportunity to disseminate any views, just so long as they are not at loggerheads with the principles of our state and social system enshrined in the Constitution. However, the fact of the matter is that the preachers of many of the political trends that have appeared in our society—from anarchists to monarchists, that is the spread of political pluralism—and of the various nationalistic and chauvinistic views, are currently undertaking an ever more vigorous political struggle for power. We do not have the right to turn a blind eye to this and not to respond accordingly.

The party and the Central Committee have defined their stand perfectly clearly. At the present stage, our objective is the revolutionary renewal of socialism, not repudiation of the choice by Lenin, the Bolsheviks, and the people in October 1917. Our aim is the cardinal renewal of the country, the modernization of its economy and sociopolitical structure in the interests, first and foremost, of society having not less but more freedom and social justice. The party, in restructuring its ranks, must preserve its main purpose, to be the expressor of the interests of the working class, the toiling peasantry and the people's intelligentsia, the generator and conduit for socialist aspirations. Such is our credo. That is what we are bringing to the next party congress, and I am convinced that such is the aim that will predominate in the work of the party congress.

Of course we attach immense importance to the ideological and political orientation the Komsomol will choose. Throughout the period since the October Revolution, our youth organization has been the party's buttress among young people. The history of relations between the party and the Komsomol is not a uniform one. These relations have been built in the past in accordance with the spirit of the authorization bureaucratic system.

Komsomol organizations have been viewed as an appendage to the party and have to a large extent been deprived of real independence. All this must be left behind, and to a considerable extent it has been overcome. Thus, the choice of ideological and political orientation your congress is to make becomes all the more significant, comrades. May I express confidence that the Komsomol will not depart from its purpose, that it will continue to march alongside the party and together with the party. [applause] Humane and democratic socialism—such is the worthy aim, the implementation in practice of which should be the life's cause for the younger generation, and its revolutionary deed for the good of the country and the people.

Now I would like to dwell on another fundamental problem, on the solution of which the future of the Komsomol and of the whole country depend. It seems to me to be of fundamental importance that our young people should not allow themselves to be distracted by a false prophet, should not give into the voices of the sirens that might ruin their lives and return the country to a morass of woes.

I am speaking now about what could be called the demon of nationalism. Right away I want to draw a clear line between the national and the nationalistic. The first includes the legitimate and rightful striving of every nation to preserve its existence, language, traditions, way of life, historic memory—all of those things without which man loses his national identity and becomes a rolling stone. Without getting into an evaluation of the events that are currently going on in the sphere of our interethnic relations, I can only say once again that our party and bodies of state power—and myself as president—see the satisfaction of the urgent needs of all our peoples through a radical transformation of the Soviet federation as one of our prime tasks.

Nationalism is another matter. I would give it the following brief description: a striving to ensure superiority to one's own nation and to satisfy its interests without taking account of the interests of other peoples, or even by infringing them. It is clear that the nationalism of some can only provoke nationalism in others. And today you and I can find live arguments to corroborate this thesis. A vicious circle of hatred is taking shape, and, comrades, it is sometimes extremely difficult to break out from it. And this, too, we already see in our life today. Nationalism is terrifying in all its manifestations, and especially when it grips the minds of the young generation. This is a withering and blinding feeling.

Therefore, it is extremely important that, whatever organizational changes the Komsomol may undergo, whatever decisions regarding its future structure and program are made, the principle of internationalism must be retained as a precondition for this organization's existence or, even more, as a precondition for preserving our multinational state. Absurd accusations levelled at the great idea that was proclaimed for the first time by Marx and Engles in the "Manifesto of the Communist Party" should be discarded, I have in mind the allegations that internationalism implies swallowing nations up and dissolving them in a single proletarian melting pot. Incidentally, in the recent past, our theoreticians provided grounds for that; among many politically... theorectically and politically irresponsible theses, they put forward the idea of merging the nations, and not only in discussions but also at the level of most important political program documents, thus transferring the idea on to the plane of concrete policy.

It is true that the authoritarian buraucratic system almost always falsified the true content of internationalism and tried to foist on everyone the same standards, to force, as I have already said, the process of the merging of nations. It allowed injustices with regard to whole peoples. All this is so, all this took place. But this cannot shake that enormous noble capital which appeared as a result of the many years of work by all our peoples. Neither can it diminish the significance of the internationalist idea itself, which under no circumstances denies the need for the preservation of the self-government, independence, and individuality of nations.

The vitality of this idea is being proved today both by European and world experience. After all, humanity, although stage by stage overcoming various impediments, undeviatingly moves toward the increasingly broad development of economic, cultural, political and, simply, human ties. Free nations, while remaining themselves, are increasingly joining the united human family. Let us always remember this so as not to move, even temporarily, backwards, away from that which the whole development of world civilization is leading to. Such a danger does exist and I do not think I need to list the relevant facts here. You can see them yourselves and you know them.

We will set the overall objective of the younger generation: to strive for the full restoration and development of the friendship of our peoples. Perhaps this should become one of the main tasks of the revitalization of the Komsomol and a genuine touchstone of the degree of success of the implementation of this revitalization.

I would like briefly to touch on a matter that concerns all of us today, above all. How are we, in the immediate future, to improve the situation in the economy and in people's living conditions? How are we to ease the position of the people, particularly the low-paid, and to improve the situation on the consumer market, at least partially to put an end to the shortages which poison the whole atmosphere of public life and which unsettle people?

Having analyzed the situation, we have reached the conclusion that the implementation of the economic reform must be speeded up, and for the main measures in this area that were planned for 1992 and 1993 to be carried out this year and at the beginning of next year. The president and the Presidential Council intend to use the powers of the head of state to ensure that a whole package of measures are adopted in the near future, aimed at giving new dynamism to the tranformations in the economy, and above all, to ensure the effective implementation of the new principles of economic management, in accordance with the fundamental laws adopted by the Supreme Soviet. Let us not run ahead of events.

So I will exempt myself from being specific in this question. I will just say that this Saturday [14 April] there will be a joint meeting of the Presidential Council and the Council of the Federation which will examine the proposal on this matter from the Soviet Government. First of all they must make a choice, and then put their proposal forward for discussion by the people. But I can already say—the situation makes it possible to make a forecast—that they must be very responsible decisions, difficult decisions, but essential ones, and we need national agreement about how to continue with this business. There must be agreement within society, on the basis of the proposals that are worked out. Ahead of us is an exceptionally responsible time, a time for responsible choice. That lies ahead. Even now—I wanted, and wrote myself a note to say this to you—there are many guesses, forecasts, and opinions in the mass media. Some press organs and some journalists, who have not taken the trouble to understand things, have not waited for the results of the forthcoming sittings—I foresee more than one of them of the Presidential Council and the Council of the Federation—are sounding the alarm, are already sounding the alarm, and are almost calling for us to embark on the path of radicalizing the economic transformations.

It is a paradoxical situation. Sometimes we fiercely criticize the slowness of the reforms, their indecisiveness and half-heartedness, and plead for them to be speeded up. Then without having understood anything, without having even seen the proposals to speed up the reforms, we are already shouting, with enviable enthusiasm: They will not get through! [previous words in Spanish] That is the entire reality of our life and of our perestroyka process. In this regard you must be as sober-minded as one may be at Komsomol age. Because at this age energy is the main force after all. Yet I call on you to be sober-minded. This is the time we are living in. For you to be together and be the motive shock brigade in implementing the plans for the radicalization of economic reform. Stretching things out makes the situation in the country worse; we must make our choice and go on decisively.

In this context, all of this bears a direct relationship to you, and not only at a general civic level. Young people do, of course, have their own set of aims and requirements in life. Youth problems have now surfaced all at once, as it were, laid bare in all their acuteness and complexity. They have attracted intense attention from society. It is precisely perestroyka that has highlighted the urgent need to respond in deeds to the now acute problems of the young generation; above all, by drawing up and implementing an integrated state policy with regard to young people. We arrived at this decision earlier, at the 19th all-union party conference. The USSR Supreme Soviet is currently examining matters relating to laying down general principles for such a policy in legislation. I have been told that the draft law was adopted after the first reading yesterday. That is all on this matter.

In the course of the broad discussion that has developed, various views, including skeptical ones, are being expressed with regard to the expediency of special legislative acts and concepts on youth. There really is no sense in reducing everything merely to the elaboration of another concept, to the adoption of a decision by the center, or to arguments about allocating mythical billions worth of funds. The main thing is, in my view, to achieve a decisive turn by all of society toward the real concerns of young people and to guarantee their participation with equal rights in general political and general social processes.

We did not have this. Moreover, today we are able to say that young people are also in a greater state of alienation from property and production and power, and to a certain degree, from culture than other sections of our society. It is not easy to find a way out of this. It is not easy. At the economic and legal level, it is important correctly to create conditions with an eye on the long-term, so that young people can fulfill their interests and defend their labor rights in conditions of changing economic relations. I would say that a particular problem, perhaps even the key problem, here is that the state and society should come to the aid of the young person at the start of his life. At the same time, the individual's place in society should be determined not just by age but by ability, level of education, qualifications, and attitude to the job. This is needed too. There should be no privileges of any kind.

At the political level, the full participation of young people in the life of society should be the norm. I have to say, however, that even if we had the very best laws, the most extensive democracy and glasnost, and the very broadest competition, these would still not guarantee that this aim would be achieved. Much depends on your own position and activity. I think that as we analyze the last election campaign and what preceded the Congress of the USSR People's Deputies, and what has happened in the republics and at the local level, we must talk of the fact that neither your nor our own hopes have been fulfilled. This speaks of the weakness of the party's actions with regard to the younger generation, and of the weaknesses and a certain immaturity of the younger generation itself. So far, they have not gone beyond meetings. They have mastered the mechanisms for holding meetings. It doesn't take very much. You just need to have free time, or to leave your studies behind and throw yourself into that element, quicken your blood, shout a bit and use your voice. That, yes. No doubt the democracy process can't exist without meetings, apart from those who meet for a reason no one understands or those who are manipulated by certain political forces. But although the party has already come out of the trenches, and although it was already a different party at the recent elections, it has as yet acquired only a feeble grasp of the art of participating in the political process, in the broad democratic process; and the Komsomol members are showing a feeble mastery of this art, too. This is a lesson for you and for us. But this is the only way of jumping into the whole active political process. Of course, from the point of view of the party and, I think, of the whole society, it is absurd to keep young people on the sidelines of political activity. This is simply a misfortune for the whole country. We know that this did take place at certain stages and we know what the consequences were—the ageing of everything, both the apparatus and all the echelons of power, the loss of energy, conservatism and losses in society's progress. The implementation of young people's rights and freedoms is inseparable from the conscientous fulfillment by young men and women of their civic duties. Such is the live and dialectic link between both. And this is the only way truly active citizens and conscious creators of the revolutionary process of rejuvenating the country can be formed within the youth movement. On the social plane, the whole atmosphere in society and the state policy should promote the opening up of the creative potential of the young generation, its growth and expansion. This is equally true for the sphere of public production and the system of public education, science and culture. I think the state has many concerns here. No investments give greater return than those in education in culture. This has been understood but has not yet been transformed into specific decisions in a real way. Only first steps have been taken yet. We must do this, and this will be translated into the creation of new conditions so that the country's young men and women enabling may be prepared as they join in life's activities. There are lots of issues here, and not only financial ones.

All of this is the responsibility and concern of the state, and also of the Komsomol.

Dear comrades, each succeeding generation goes about life in its own way. The originality of your way is inimitable. Above all, it is inimitable because you are living at a particular time. The years of your youth have coincided with perestroyka. The enormous novelty of this historic process requires a new mentality, rejects narrow-mindedness, destroys stereotypes, and heightens the role of knowledge and morality. You young people have to understand and discover anew—both for yourselves and for all society—much that past experience and old knowledge do not supply positive answers to. This must be recognized. That is the way it is. I am firmly convinced that, objectively speaking, by reaching out to the future the new processes in society are targeted on the need for global changes. Ultimately of course, they are addressed to the young people, their dreams and their plans for life. Let us walk this path together, tackling the many difficult tasks that the times in which we live have thrown up and set before us. Thank you. [applause]

Congress Delegates Attend

LD1004210490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] Today Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, president of the USSR and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met the delegates to the 21st Congress of the VLKSM [Komsomol]. It opens tomorrow in Moscow. There was a lively and committed conversation about further ways of developing the Komsomol and the prospects of the youth movement in our country.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev addressed the representatives of the multi-million detachment of the Soviet Komsomol.

The meeting was attended by Comrades Medvedev, Razumovskiy, Girenko, Manayenkov, Stroyev, Usmanov, and Frolov.

The delegates to the congress laid a wreath at the mausoleum of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. The ceremony was attended by Comrade Gorbachev.

New Program To Be Adopted

LD1104064190 Moscow TASS in English 0631 GMT 11 Apr 90

[By TASS corespondent Galina Vinitskaya]

[Text] Moscow April 11 TASS—The 21st Congress of the Soviet Young Communists—Komsomol—will open here today to discuss the renewal of the organisation and adopt a new progamme and rules.

Perestroyka has stirred up the youth movement in the country. The 20th Komsomol Congress in 1987 oriented young people towards participation in political, economic and social tansformations. The organisation became more active in protecting the rights and interests of young people in all spheres and began to elaborate fundamentals of youth policy.

Seventy-five Komsomol members were elected USSR people's deputies last year. Besides, a committee on youth issues has been set up by the USSR Supreme Soviet. A bill "On General Lines of the State Youth Policy in the USSR" is now under consideration.

However, the Komsomol has not revised its relations with party and state bodies and, according to many, lacks a clear stand on Communist Party restructuring. This resulted in the loss of trust of politically active young people.

Meanwhile, "The Komsomol Report to the 21st Congress" published two weeks ago, notes that the relationship between the party and Komsomol so far remain unchanged.

The Soviet media more and more often stresses that "The faithful helper of the party", Komsomol, has lost its authority among the majority of young people. Ten million people have left the organisation since 1985.

A democratic movement, "Surgut-alternative", named after a Siberian City, was formed in January, 1989, to call for the creation of socialist, social democratic, Christian and other youth organizations in the Soviet Union.

But First Secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee Viktor Mironenko believes that Komsomol should remain "Leninist" and "communist" since this is the essence of the union.

The desire of union republics to be independent has lead to similar tendencies in Komsomol. For instance, in Lithuania the organisation has split into two groups, one of which remains part of the Union Komsomol.

The Estonian Komsomol has already proclaimed its independence and last February a Russian youth union was created.

Gorbachev Greetings to Media Forum Conveyed

LD1004124690 Moscow TASS in English 1225 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 10 TASS—Member of the Soviet Presidential Council Academician Yuriy Osipyan conveyed the cordial greetings and best wishes of President Gorbachev and the Soviet public to participants in the 11th conference of the world media association.

Correspondents, politicians, and public and religious figures from over 40 states are attending the conference, which opened here today.

The forum also hosts the third conference of the Summit Council for World Peace and the ninth conference of the Association for the Unity of Latin America.

Holding this conference in Moscow expresses the feelings the world public holds towards the Soviet state and people, at a time when vigorous actions are being taken here to change Soviet life, Osipyan said.

Perestroyka is influencing not only Soviet life but the whole world, the academician said. An understanding of common human values promotes our desire to make life better for all people.

"An understanding of the integrity of our common destiny and of the unity and interrelation of the world predominates the world today." Albert Vlasov, chairman of the NOVOSTI press agency board, told the opening ceremony. The press agency is one of the forum's sponsors."

"Vlasov noted that the conference is being held as the democratisation of world relations accelerates."

Soviet domestic and foreign policy is inseparable from perestroyka and glasnost, he added. Thanks to glasnost, past mistakes, the mechanisms of our stagnation and current problems are being revealed. At the same time, new ideas are being elaborated and better ways towards a just society and equal world found.

Glasnost means the ability to face the truth and understand each other' points of view.

Vlasov noted that the world is overcoming the aftereffects of the cold war and is encouraging cooperation, which marked the creation of the Soviet state 70 years ago. "We are trying to bring cooperation and communication between peoples to life and to think in an unusual and broad way, displaying goodwill and trust," he said.

Maslennikov Conducts News Conference 10 Apr

LD1004212190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1830 GMT 10 Apr 90

[News conference by Arkadiy Afrikanovich Maslennikov, USSR presidential press secretary, with foreign and domestic correspondents; in Moscow on 10 April—recorded]

[Text] [Maslennikov] As you know, the second session of the Presidential Council was held yesterday, with the president, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, chairing. I am sure you have read reports about this in the newspapers today. I can only say that the main issue dealt with there, almost the only one, was that of the situation in and around Lithuania. This was discussed in much detail. All the members of the Presidential Council spoke, and all the speeches were imbued with one and the same feeling—a feeling of alarm and worry about the future of the people of that republic, and about how perestroyka would develop in our country, how the process of renewal of the Soviet federation would develop. It was stated that the reply which the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] gave to the message from President Gorbachev is unsatisfactory. It is not of a constructive character. It proceeds from the same supposition that Lithuania has declared itself independent, that it has thus broken with political relations in the old form, and is going its own way. This course has been recognized as unconstructive, as leading to a dead end, and as creating difficulties, I repeat, both for the republic itself and for the country as a whole. In connection with this, the members of the Presidential Council came to the conclusion that it is necessary to adopt further measures of an economic, political, and other nature to defend the USSR Constitution and the rights and interests of the citizens living both on the territory of the republic itself and in the country as a whole. That is what happened yesterday at the Presidential Council.

Your question, please.

[Kiselev] Dmitriy Kiselev, from the "Vremya" program. In the official report yesterday on the session of the Presidential Council, it was said that economic, political, and other measures would be adopted concerning Lithuania. What is specifically meant by other measures? That is the first question.

[Maslennikov] I think I have to start by replying to the first part of this question. You say economic measures. Well, you understand what an abnormal situation is forming at the moment. The Lithuanian authorities are stating that they do not wish to have normal relations within the framework of the Constitution or relationships in the political sphere, but would like, as they have both written and said, to preserve the existing economic ties. There is an internal contradiction here. I think that PRAVDA was correct today when it wrote that a sudden break in political relations could lead to disruption, or as it says there, a sudden break in economic ties. You know what this is about. For example, the Lithuanian SSR, like other republics of the Soviet Union, enjoys very favorable conditions for supply of fuels, first and foremost, and for other types of raw material, which are at least twice as cheap as the cost on the world market, and at the same time they insist on certain advantages in other spheres. I can only say—I don't know what measures the government will adopt in this regard, but I do know that enterprises in various parts of the country are expressing alarm and dissatisfaction at these circumstances, and are expressing uncertainty about whether contracts should be concluded, for example, with partners in the Lithuanian SSR in circumstances where, in fact, the talk is plainly, at government level, of setting up customs controls, establishing other restrictive measures concerning these ties. So I am not in a position...[changes thought] I can only say that they did not speak about any specific measures, absolutely definite ones, but they spoke about the principles of the issue, about the fact that such measures might be adopted at government level, or might simply be adopted by individual enterprises, associations, or business circles, as they say.

[Kiselev] But what, then, is the ultimate objective of all these actions that are being undertaken—Lithuania as part of the USSR? If so, how realistic is it, how is this assessed in the Presidential Council?

[Maslennikov] In the Presidential Council it is assessed like this, we see that...[changes thought] hope is expressed that both the Lithuanian leadership and the Lithuanian people—first and foremost it is a question of the Lithuanian leadership—that they will nevertheless take the path of reason, assess the real situation as it is, and give up attempts which are in the nature of unilateral ultimatums to impose their own understanding of the process. The complex fabric of economic, social, humanitarian, and political relations which exist between this republic and the other republics and their partners in the union cannot be torn up in a single hour, in a single night, by means of the adoption of certain decrees. That is a road leading into a blind alley. That isn't sensible. That is viewed as the path leading to misfortunes, so to speak.

[Unidentified speaker] So Lithuania still remains part of the USSR?

[Maslennikov] That must be decided, that will be decided, by the Lithuanian people themselves. You know that a law on deciding issues, so to speak, on the mechanism for withdrawal from the Soviet Union, has now been adopted, and if as a result of a referendum, for example, the Lithuanians decide that it is more convenient and more advantageous and better for them to live as an independent state, then that is their affair, but these questions have to be settled on the basis of the Constitution, on the basis of taking into account the interests of all partners in the union—economic, political, and other interests, interests of security, too.

[IRISH TIMES correspondent] The Irish newspaper IRISH TIMES. Is there the possibility that at the end of the road there will be presidential rule in Lithuania?

[Maslennikov] I think I have already answered this question when I said that the president and the government are showing great restraint and are using and intending to use all possibilities for a political resolution, in order to convince the leaders of Lithuania and in order to let it be understood by the Lithuanian people that the road which the republic has now taken is not productive but is counterproductive. Unfortunately, the situation is such that one-sided propaganda is being directed at the Lithuanians themselves. Radio, television, and other mass media, the newspapers, they are monopolized in full by Sajudis and by forces close to it. The Lithuanians have to know what the issues are. There is euphoria there which is totally unjustified, that if they break off ties, then tomorrow they will live as the Swedes live. That is not true. I can remind you of the speech at the congress by Yuriy Dmitriyevich Maslyukov, the chairman of the State Planning Committee, when he said that if relations between the Lithuanian Republic and the remainder of the union were put onto world prices, then the republic would instantaneously have an annual deficit of R3.7 billion—gold rubles. That's no joke. That couldn't be sustained by the economy of that republic.

[(?Stepanov Anatoliy) of IZVESTIYA] Is some resolution of the problem possible other than the official repeal by Lithuania's parliament of the laws that it has adopted?

[Maslennikov] I do not think that any forms or methods—transitional forms—can be ruled out which would lead to the whole situation returning to what it was on 10 March. That is to say, I think that here the president and the government are displaying the necessary flexibility in the drive toward the ultimate objective, a constitutional resolution of the problem.

[Unidentified PRAVDA correspondent] PRAVDA. The following question: Has the internal situation in Lithuania been taken into consideration or will it be taken into consideration in the measures that have been worked out or in the contemplated measures? I am thinking of the desire for autonomy on the part of the rayons with a predominantly Polish population.

[Maslennikov] When the resolution speaks of economic, political, and other measures, then the whole set of problems is being taken into consideration. It is known, for example, that Belorussia has already stated, through what the republican Supreme Soviet Presidium says, that should Lithuania leave the Soviet Union, it would demand the return of territories which were annexed, Belorussian territories which were annexed to Lithuania in August 1940. Incidentally, this decision was adopted at the time over the head of the Belorussian republican authorities, as a gesture of goodwill and as a form of help for the Lithuanian Republic. The Belorussian leadership is stating that if there is a break in relations with the Soviet Union, and hence with the other republics, this treaty, this law which was adopted at that time, loses its force, and these territories will have to be returned. Incidentally, there are many such twists and turns in territorial matters, with some very peculiar ones. For example, I have been told that at the last meeting in Vilnius organized by Sajudis, a map of Lithuania passed from hand to hand describing territorial claims against all of Lithuania's neighbors—Latvia, Belorussia, Poland and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. So you understand, this is a very tight knot. But I think that if the leadership of Lithuania is going to take this path, it is, all the same, the republic that will end up the loser.

[Unidentified correspondent] Yesterday, there was a proposal from the Soyuz group for the disbandment of Sajudis and annulment of the results of the elections in the Lithuanian Republic. As far as I am aware, this proposal was submitted to the Presidential Council. Is it possible that these proposals will be examined by the council and accepted?

[Maslennikov] The Presidential Council did not give special consideration to the proposal of the Soyuz group. The Soyuz group made a trip there on its own initiative, as a group, it has reflected certain sentiments of certain circles both within the republic and in the country as a whole which, as it were, obviously also have a right to exist. They are evidence of the profound concern that part of the population feels, first and foremost, that they brought back the heat of emotion, worry, and fear that exists in the republic itself. But that is one of the points of view, one of the opinions that presently exist in our multiethnic and pluralist society.

[INTERFAX correspondent] Soviet radio, INTERFAX. At one time, when the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan had reached a certain temperature, a joint meeting was held at an open session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Is it not being planned now to invite the leadership of Lithuania to a session of the Presidential Council?

[Maslennikov] The leadership of Lithuania, and Landsbergis as chairman of the Supreme Soviet in particular, has carte blanche to visit both sessions of the Supreme Soviet and sessions of the Council of the Federation, ex officio. We do not view Lithuania as a separate state, but as a republic, an equal one, with all the consequences ensuing from that.

[Unidentified correspondent] What have you to say about the reports alleging that the Vatican will send its representative [name indistinct] to settle the question of Lithuania, that is, to take part in it somehow.

[Maslennikov] Well, I can only repeat that the Lithuanian Republic is part of the Soviet Union, and the central government and the president have no intention of resorting to any foreign middlemen for negotiations with the government and Supreme Soviet of the republic. If anyone enters into any private contacts with the leadership of Lithuania and advises them to take a more sensible path—and the Western press is giving such advice, and it is there in public statements—well, that is their affair. I would only wish for the Lithuanian leadership to heed such advice.

[NEPSZABADSAG correspondent] The Hungarian NEPSZABADSAG. In the latest issue of NOVOYE VREMYA, the view is expressed that Belorussia's demands for the return of those territories is a violation of the Helsinki process and will undermine the whole process of European security. Do you agree with that?

[Maslennikov] I have already said that there exists the point of view of the Supreme Soviet of Belorussia, which bases itself upon documents and historical facts and which also very logically bases the argument for its own position on the fact that the abrogation of certain individual provisions or individual agreements brings with it the abrogation of others. Everything here is linked by a single chain. Belorussia is not making direct territorial claims and is not demanding the surrender of these territories which were removed from it and added to Lithuania if Lithuania itself does not violate the territorial integrity in this case of the Soviet Union. So if one is to talk about who here is capable of encroaching upon the inviolability of borders, then one has to be talking rather about the leadership of Lithuania.

[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA correspondent] SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. We know that propaganda in Lithuania is one-sided in its character. You have just talked about this. We even know that SOVETSKAYA LITVA is being printed in Belorussia, although there was an instruction by the president that, well, everything should be put into its proper place. The instruction is not being carried out. What is going to be done in the very near future to normalize this question?

[Maslennikov] As far as I know, the president did not give a direct instruction that SOVETSKAYA LITVA should be printed in Lithuania. The president did not go into such details. But this is one of those anomalies which have now cropped up and which, as they say, are permeating the whole fabric of relations, economic and social and in this case, evidently, even cultural and political relations, and which undoubtedly have to be put right.

[(?Menasov)] Arkadiy Afrikanovich, you have just been talking about negotiations. But who is hampering things? Judging by the information that we have, Lithuania is willing to take part in talks at any time. Who is it that is not moving to take part in such talks? I am at a loss to understand....

[Maslennikov, interrupting] Read their statements carefully, comrade (?Menasov), and you will see that they are proposing talks between one state and another state, interstate talks. That does not exist in reality. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics exists, of which Lithuania forms a part. In this Union of Soviet Socialist Republics there is a Constitution. There are laws. They include a law about the mechanism for secession from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Any talks can be conducted on the basis of these laws, but not on the basis of the fact that you are breaking off all ties, that you say that you are another state, so to speak, so let's act now. This is the only thing at issue. Talks are possible: They could start to be conducted with Lithuania, they will be conducted with Lithuania, if they return to their initial positions, so to speak. It is possible that the same questions will be asked by other republics—that is why the law was adopted which has just gone through the Supreme Soviet and which you have reported in your esteemed newspaper, GUDOK.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP correspondent] The Hungarian newspaper MAGYAR HIRLAP. My first question is this: Is the council also troubled by the situation of Estonia? That is my first question. And my second question: Is the Presidential Council worried by the fact that the international situation will deteriorate after the measures; were any opinions expressed along these lines at the sitting of the Presidential Council?

[Maslennikov] I didn't quite understand what measures you're talking about. As for Estonia, the situation in Estonia was not discussed.

[Unidentified correspondent] [name indistinct] Agency. Tell us, please. What is President Gorbachev's reaction to the position of the United States and a number of Western countries over the situation? Is he satisfied or not?

[Maslennikov] Well, since all Western countries are officially displaying a certain restraint and are trying not to crudely interfere in the Soviet Union's internal affairs...[changes thought] In that sense, the Soviet leadership, including President Gorbachev, assesses the West's position positively. But, since individual groups of politicians, including in the United States, specifically in the Congress, pass resolutions that constitute interference in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union, such attempts are decisively rejected by our country.

[Unidentified correspondent] There was an announcement, I think, (?somewhere) that there will be a summit meeting in Washington very soon. Are you not afraid that, perhaps, your measures will be too severe, in principle, and that, perhaps, this meeting will not take place?

[Maslennikov] I don't think that there is any such danger now. We are conducting our own affairs in our own country, as it were, gearing ourselves toward what is happening in our country. I don't think that the question should be put as you are putting it, because, if, let's say, the Soviet Union had adopted such positions albeit only approximately, then we would not have met the United States during the past 10 years at least—especially after the United States' interference in Panama, to which it sent troops to arrest the president of a foreign country. As for our internal affairs, we handle them according to the situation in our country. We understand the anxiety that is being displayed in international circles in connection with the development of events, since there are in the situation the seeds of instability. It has been said about this that, if, let's say, the situation develops in such a way that more and more aggravation results, then that is, of course, an undesirable development of events. But I would not look so pessimistically on the prospects for the Soviet-U.S. summit that you've mentioned. The preparations are proceeding normally. There are certain difficulties, but, in general, they are proceeding apace.

Go ahead.

[AP correspondent] ASSOCIATED PRESS. What results do you expect from these new measures? Do you really think that the Lithuanian people will change their decision?

[Maslennikov] We really think that, as the Lithuanian people realize the full ruinousness of the policy toward which it is being pushed by the present leadership, the situation in Lithuania and the mood in Lithuania will change. That's why our government and the president are showing immense patience, self-possession, and restraint in tackling these questions. We don't want to quarrel with the Lithuanian people. We want the Lithuanian people to understand the advantages of a constitutional development and to understand the ruinousness of the convulsive—to put it no more harshly—actions that have been taken so far by the Lithuanian leadership and which have led to a crisis and are making the situation more acute. During the brief period of 30 days that have elapsed since the 11th [March], about 80 legal enactments, decisions, and administrative acts have been adopted which run directly counter to both the USSR Constitution and to the legislation that is in force throughout the union. This is the method of confrontation. It is a counter productive method. It is a method that leads to a dead end.

[ANSA correspondent] The ANSA Agency, Italy. Since, that is from what you have said, it seems to me, if I am not mistaken, that the planned economic measures will create some kind of economic blockade against Lithuania. What will the political measures be?

[Maslennikov] Well, to begin, I did not use the word blockade. And I did not impart the meaning, even the hidden meaning of blockade, in my statements. I can say that, for example, things are much better in Lithuania than in all the other republics regarding car fuel. The Mazeikiai oil refinery works is there with a capacity of about 13 million tonnes, which fully satisfies the needs of the republic. It receives all of the necessary raw materials. And in Lithuania, in contrast to, let us say Moscow, there are no queues at gas stations. Even more so, there are no problems in Lithuania with the refuelling of tractors for spring sowing such as those, let us say, in the Ukraine. Therefore to speak of something similar to a blockade is not only premature, but it is simply not fair. As far as those advantages are concerned which the Lithuanian authorities at times attempt to utilize onesidedly—they for example, while enjoying all of these privileges, permit themselves, let us say, to refuse credit to the military units which are stationed on the territory of Lithuania and cease paying pensions to servicemen and former servicemen—such measures cannot be called anything other than provocation. Evidently, rsponsibility must be born. Therefore the matter in hand is some kind of improvement, straightening out of relations. Play cannot be in one direction here.

[Unidentified correspondent] You speak about the fact that the president is open to some kind of transitionary measures for returning to the state of affairs on 10 March. It is clear that it is very difficult to revoke immediately, let us say, all of these decisions. So Bickauskas, the Lithuanian representative in Moscow, does not exclude the possibility of nonetheless organizing a referendum. Would the organization of a referendum now be sufficient for the president and the Presidential Council? Or must there be a decision by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet on the repeal and only on the repeal of the decisions adopted previously?

[Maslennikov] You know, the issues of the referendum is very important but it will of course not be resolved from one day to the next. You understand, a referendum can distort public opinion in the same way as any other decision if the people who take part in the referendum do not have a real choice. Any referendum must be preceded by much preparatory work where the various positions, various points of view formulated are properly interpreted for the population. As far as, as you put it, transitionary or intermediate measures are concerned, I did not notice in, let us say, the position of theh president and the government, such an ossification. So, as it were, the most diverse options are being considered and the only thing which remains unshakeable is the return to a constitutional path. What the form of the return to this constitutional path is, is already an issue for, as is said, discussion, an issue for debate, an issue for interpretation, first and foremost by the Lithuanian leadership itself. The point is for the Lithuanian leadership itself to renounce ossification.

[Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 10 April in its "Vremya" newscast carries a report on this news conference which includes a recording of the following exchange in English:

[Unidentified correspondent] My first question is: How could President Gorbachev use presidential decrees in Lithuania, and will he use presidential decrees in Lithuania?

[Maslennikov] How he will use [it], he will decide when he decides to use it.]

Moscow Conference Views Future of Cable TV

PM0604104390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 7

[Report by Vl. Arsenyev and I. Kukin: "Cable Plus Cable—A Different Television?"]

[Text] There is probably no more intriguing subject in the world of television now than the development of a cable broadcasting network and the emergence of many independent television studios. Even though they are officially called "cable television studios" or, as in Zaporozhye Oblast, for example, a "cable television information system," only a totally slow-witted person could doubt that an era of television different to that to which we are accustomed will begin tomorrow, if not today.

What will it be like? What can we expect? The first All-Union Conference on Cable Television was able to give the answers to these questions. Workers from Gosteleradio [State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting] held it at their "Sofrino" House of Creativity last week.

Who knows, maybe in years to come a future television historian will have a good word for these two days in March as the first step onto a new rung of the information civilizing of society. Many foreign countries long ago went through the stage of what is happening to cable television here. But it is all new to us. According to time-honored tradition, we start comprehending the realities of life "at the last moment," having already encountered them in earnest.

To whom must cable television be subordinate? In France, for example, it is under state control, and in the FRG licenses to organize cable networks are issued by the land authorities. We do not know whether it was the French model or some other one that led to the thought that cable television must be centralized and united under the wing of the USSR Gosteleradio.

Yes, life demands definiteness, and so representatives of cable television studios, which we have in Tallinn, Vladivostok, Minsk, and Magadan, traveled to Sofrino near Moscow. Many were in an anxious frame of mind. The previous, albeit small, experience of cooperation with local television and radio committees had inured them. And since the initiative to create the USSR Cable Television Union had come from Gosteleradio, the alarming thought—"...do they not want to take us in hand?"—not only hung in the air but was also heard in speeches.

But, for us, the debates and the speeches by the Sofrino conference participants helped to define the system of coordinates in which Soviet cable television finds itself today....

As Gosteleradio Deputy Chairman Khenrikas Yushkyavichyus said in his introductory speech, the main reason for this conference is the contradictions that have arisen among cable television studios. Maybe "contradictions" is not quite the word to express the essence of the problem. This is not the point. While our studios have many features and problems in common, they are very unlike each other. Starting with the scope and breadth of their field of activity and ending with their level of technical equipment. There is nothing surprising here, if you remember that they have all been organized in recent years mainly according to the principle "who dares, eats."

How many cable television studios do we have? The most accurate answer is: many. There are certainly more than 100 of them, but however impressive this figure may be in absolute terms, it is not that great with regard to the size of the country. And the number is changing literally every month. Of course, there are problems common to all. Questions of subordination, organizational structure (general principles), copyright. As regards equipment, there is a natural law here: Everything depends on the founder's solvency and financial potential.

This is why the participants' speeches were quite contradictory. To be honest, we never did ascertain finally for whom life is better: for a small studio with 1,500 subscribers or, let us say, the aforementioned Zaporozhye television information system, which has "cabled" its entire city. It also depends on who has what supertasks.

Will cable television become an alternative to state television over the airwaves? Do Gosteleradio's proposals really represent an attempt to establish its diktat or rigid control over the vital activity of cable television studios? According to Gosteleradio's leaders, neither they nor central television are seeking a diktat. Whether or not a union is created, the Law on the Press or the Law on Television will in any case define in the future a clear-cut procedure governing the activity of cable television. The union's task is to help positive trends to develop.

For the time being, as Viktor Zharkov, chief of Gosteleradio's Legal Department, told us, the situation is rather paradoxical. For Lenin's 1917 decree is the only legislative act on the mass media in the whole time that Soviet power has been in existence. The law never keeps pace with life, and in the United States, for example, the first normative acts on cable television were adopted in 1952, when it was already developing vigorously. Incidentally, in the very near future the USSR will subscribe to the 1896 Bern Convention on copyright protection. Its rules are very tough. Meanwhile, we use the resolutions that do exist. In particular, the 1971 USSR Council of Ministers special resolution stating that Gosteleradio directs all television organizations in the country. Viktor Zharkov also believes that an independent cable television union is definitely needed. The fact that it is being created on the Gosteleradio's initiative certainly does not mean that the problems of cable television will be resolved in a way convenient to Gosteleradio. On the contrary, it is possible that there will be situations in which the union will protect its members from Gosteleradio if, let us say, the latter attempts to exceed its powers.

So the first familiarization of people employed in cable networks has taken place. So far there is little cause for impetuous joy. The official results are these: An organizing committee has been set up with the chief task of preparing for the future union's constituent conference or congress. There are two groups on the organizing committee for the creative sphere and the technical sphere. But this is probably not the chief point. The greatest achievement of the Sofrino conference is the fact that people who now belong to one cause have gotten acquainted. This means that ties and cooperation will develop. And this is reassuring.

Plans for 5-6 May PRAVDA Festival Described

PM0604133190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Mar 90 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Come to the PRAVDA Festival! It Will Be Held 5-6 May in Moscow at the National Economic Achievements Exhibition"]

[Text] It will be no revelation that many associate the processes taking place in our party today with PRAVDA newspaper. Indeed, the editor's office is trying to reflect the present changes within the CPSU, the progress of renewal, and the difficulties which are occurring, while also reorganizing itself. The search is on for new forms and methods of journalistic and ideological work, and links with party organizations and with you, our dear readers, are being improved. These forms, of course, have been far from exhausted.

A decision was recently made: Henceforth to hold an annual 5 May festival of PRAVDA—of the newspaper founded by V.I. Lenin. Its first issue came out on that day 78 years ago, and the proletariat has kept the newspaper going with its hard-earned kopeks. It was and still is one of the biggest daily mass publications in the country and the whole world.

The present, first festival is not a jubilee festival. It takes place at a complex time. We have all witnessed concentrated, and at times organized, attacks on the party and on PRAVDA, both from the right and the left. Appreciating our responsibility for the prospective fate of the CPSU, we are preparing seriously for the changes in the country's political climate. That is why the forthcoming festival is intended above all as a major event of a precisely political nature. It must become one of the important landmarks in the preparation for the 28th CPSU Congress, and an event aimed at strengthening the prestige of the party and of the party press, and their links with the masses.

In preparing for our festival, we are counting on the support of all the healthy forces of society and, it must be bluntly stated, we are not plucking these calculations out of thin air. Lately PRAVDA has been endeavoring increasingly energetically to conduct a frank and trusting dialogue with its readers. Judging by the letters, and we receive over 2,000 of them daily, there are many people in the country in agreement with us who share the position of the newspaper, which expresses and persistently propagandizes the ideas of the CPSU Central Committee platform. Today the contents of the newspaper columns and the character of the publication are shaped by their advice and businesslike suggestions. There is a mass of communists and a multitude of nonparty people among our staunch supporters. We do not hide the fact that we would like the number of such supporters to go on increasing. Further evidence that this process is going on and another argument in favor of the desirability of the forthcoming festival is the friends of PRAVDA clubs which are now springing up in various regions of the country. The first such club appeared in Alma-Ata just before the new year of 1990. The short report about this provoked an immediate response in party organizations and work collectives. Immediately afterward, friends of the newspaper united in Krasnoyarsk, Moscow, Kiev, Minsk, Odessa, Stavropol Kray, Tula Oblast, and dozens of other cities, oblasts, and rayons. The need has evidently arisen to discuss material on questions of principle, especially that being published in the revived "discussion sheet" features; the necessity for collective thinking has appeared; interest in the past and the future of the newspaper has been aroused. We are taking these processes into account while preparing for the festival and, of course, the friends of PRAVDA will be our welcome guests.

Communist newspaper festivals have become a fine tradition in many countries of the world. At our festival we would like to utilize all the valuable experience of fraternal newspapers.

The main thing is communication between people and their exchange of opinions on the most pressing problems of contemporary life, for which purpose meetings, discussions, and roundtables, where people will be able to have their say about what worries them most, are planned. The festival is an opportunity to propagandize actively the ideas of perestroyka, to discuss the precongress platform of the CPSU Central Committee, and to consolidate the vast masses of the workers around the platform. It means journalists exchanging experiences, and the development of contacts and the strengthening of ties with fraternal foreign parties and their press organs, representatives of which will be visiting us. However, a cultural entertainment program awaits those who simply want to relax and have a good time.

A few days ago the festival organizing committee held its first meeting, at which the main arrangements were discussed. It was determined that the festival will be held at the USSR National Economic Achievements Exhibition and will last two days—5 and 6 May. And now in more concrete terms about what actually awaits our guests.

Meetings between workers and Politburo members, Politburo candidate members, and CPSU Central Committee secretaries are planned. Political debates featuring party and soviet staffers, people's deputies, academics, cultural figures, and prominent journalists will be held. Special party press pavilions will be organized and, of course, PRAVDA staffers will carry on a dialogue with readers, who are active contributors to the newspaper. Right here, at the National Economic Achievements Exhibition, it will be possible to familiarize oneself with the work of journalists of union and autonomous republics.

Staffers of the USSR and RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Ministries of Culture and the USSR State Committee for Physical Culture and Sports will help to put together a varied cultural and sports program. Festival guests will hear symphony orchestras and rock groups, variety shows, and performances by popular poets and bards and by amateur performers; they will see art exhibitions and scenes from theatrical performances; they will be spectators at many kinds of sports contests, including, so to speak, nontraditional ones—billiards, karate, etc. A parade of vintage cars will go around the Sadovoye beltway, and then around the grounds of the National Economic Achievements Exhibition, and numerous special interest meetings will be organized in the pavilions....

This is, of course, only a part of the forthcoming festival. In this connection we turn to our readers: Although there is not a great deal of time left, suggest what else you would like to see and hear at the festival, what else you expect from us and what you yourselves can do in order to make our common festival more interesting and colorful. We will carefully examine every idea and will try without fail to implement every good thought.

A special word from us—to participants in amateur artistic performances. If you really have an interesting program for thousands of people, send your applications to the editor's office. And the reward, we think, could be substantial—an advertisement in PRAVDA and a review of amateur collectives and individual performers.

So, the PRAVDA newspaper festival is on 5 and 6 May in Moscow at the National Economic Achievements Exhibition. We await you, dear friends, and your families and comrades. We hope that we will have an interesting time and that henceforth our PRAVDA festival will become a joyful tradition for years to come.

Composition of Organizing Committee

I.T. Frolov—CPSU Central Committee secretary, chief editor of PRAVDA newspaper (chairman);
V.I. Kuznetsov—Moscow City CPSU Committee secretary (deputy chairman);
V.G. Zakharov—RSFSR Council of Ministers deputy chairman (deputy chairman);
L.N. Spiridonov—first deputy chief editor of PRAVDA newspaper (deputy chairman);
F.D. Bobkov—USSR KGB first deputy chairman;

L.V. Drachevskiy—first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Physical Culture and Sports;
A.A. Zolotov—USSR deputy minister of culture;
A.S. Kapto—chief of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department;
A.S. Kuklinov—CPSU Central Committee deputy administrator of affairs;
V.P. Leontyev—director of PRAVDA publishing house;
S.G. Lisauskas—USSR deputy minister of internal affairs;
B.Ye. Panyukov—USSR first deputy minister of civil aviation;
S.Ye. Sarukhanov—USSR deputy minister of trade;
V.A. Savushev—general director of the USSR National Economic Achievements Exhibition.

Economic

Leading Economists on Crisis, Solutions

90UF0026A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 13, 31 Mar-6 April 90 pp 1, 2

[Report on interviews with economists participating in the annual meeting of the Economics Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences conducted by N. Zhelnorova: "Is There a Way Out of the Crisis?"]

[Text] Are only the economists to blame for all our troubles? Does economic science have a concept of the country's further development? How to escape from the impasse? These were the topics at the annual meeting of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics Department. Here are the opinions of some of its participants.

S. Shatalin, academician-secretary of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics Department:

I consider it a great omission that the Economics Department did not prepare its own program (alternative to the government program) of radical reform. We lack our own specific view and considered program of the transitional period.

We need to scientifically answer the question as to the kind of society we live in. What is happening currently: restructuring or building?

We need to move toward serious enterprise. If we do not, we will be running in place and will mess up the consumer market so much that we will never be able to put it back together again. People often talk about the "planned-market economy" and the "socialist market." I do not understand such word combinations, to put it mildly.

We have had enough of demagogy and the ideologization of certain processes. We must direct efforts toward ensuring that a modern, normal market emerges. Meanwhile all that is happening we are doing on the move, with the engine running. This does not help. What is meant by regional financial autonomy? I consider it, like plant socialism, an irrational concept. It is said that this economy will be subordinate to regional authorities. To whom, one wonders, is General Electric subordinate? The Texas district executive committee? The economy should be subordinate only to the market and the laws of the state, which takes from it normal taxes. The soviets should be dealing with social policy and the infrastructure, but business, with business. And to ensure that the needy strata of the population not suffer we will have to "rob" the upper strata. Economic efficiency and social justice need to be precisely combined.

Corresponding member N. Petrakov:

We must develop more seriously theoretical research into socialism. I believe that socialism as a concept is primarily a theory of distribution. We are now saying that all is permitted in the economy other than man's exploitation of man. But we need first to investigate what exploitation means. According to Marx, it is the appropriation of the surplus product not created by a specific individual. But may it then be considered that an invalid from birth in receipt of a pension is an exploiter? And the interest on our monetary deposits—is this unearned income? I assure you that we have exploitation both at the state enterprises and on the collective farms. A person should have the right to choose: to be either a wage worker (if he does not want to risk his income and take part in management but aspires to work strictly by the hour) or be a free workman (to form enterprises, work on his own land).

Academician L. Abalkin:

We will not switch from one system to another and accomplish a revolutionary change just like that, for a song. Society has to pay quite a high price for this. Had we accomplished this transition two or three years ago, the price would have been less. The longer we put off the transition, the more the social payment will grow. What amount of compensation should the state assume? We need to delimit the spheres of compensation here. Protecting the needy is a task for the state, what will the compensation for the rest be, however? Freedom of enterprise and economic activity could be such.

L. Vid, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, candidate of economic sciences:

I am profoundly convinced that elaborating the ancient-regime five-year plan for the 13th five-year term is a step backward. The old procedure for elaborating it is inappropriate for our turbulent, dynamic times because if we throw the net of the five-year plan over the whole country, we will be floundering around beneath it just as in the 12th Five-Year Plan.

G. Popov, doctor of economic sciences:

We wish to "both acquire capital and preserve our innocence," that is, failing to recognize reality, we are putting forward such definitions as "individual ownership" and such like terms. The market must develop according to its innate laws, not in accordance with our notions, as is the case. Price reform has been proposed here today. But how can we disregard the fact that the people have no faith in the government?! People do not believe that attempts are not being made to cheat them. So economic science will have to take account of the people's emotions.

USSR People's Deputy N. Travkin:

I was in Switzerland recently. And I was in an agony of impotent rage. Have the people who say that "capitalism is exploitation" never been there? Have economists, perhaps, not been there? They have. Consequently, we were deliberately intimidated by a normal economy. Consequently, not only the party elite but also economic science, unless it can with pain in the heart say: "You have been fooled for a long time, fellows, and you continue to be fooled," fixed itself up pretty well. Chernichenko told the truth when he said that there is starvation in our country. Because half the products which are on the shelves there I have never seen in my life.

We have created an economic system which inevitably gives rise to a mafia and corruption. And until we solve the question of the political system, we will not advance the corruption situation one step, even if we make everyone millionaires.

]V. Tikhonov, member of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences:

The first task is demonopolization in the economy. And it is impossible without denationalization and the liberation of the enterprises from dependence on the machinery of state.

I was in Japan recently. Small, cooperative or corporate firms are preponderant there—they are the most efficient. The government does not attempt to nationalize them, on the contrary, many facilities have been privatized, even the railroads have been handed over to private and corporate firms.

We also need a system of small and medium-sized enterprises—of the cooperative or collective type—operating with the support of the state. Only such a policy could lead us to the deconcentration of enterprises in the national economy which would help us ensure mobility and a change in the structure of production depending on market demand.

Two years have elapsed since the cooperative system was legislatively permitted to develop. Production has risen from R300 million to R41 billion by the start of this year. Of course, this is not fully the cooperative system which we could call the joint labor of the working people. Some 37 percent of cooperatives are strictly attached to state enterprises for the government has by its enactments pushed the cooperatives into precisely such a form. Given the absolute growth in joint labor, there is a reduction in the proportion of cooperatives producing consumer goods because the same state is persistently barring these cooperatives' access to production resources. Nonetheless, a 137-fold growth in two years is fantastic. The number of people working in the cooperatives has increased in the two years from 70,000 to 4.5 million. The product of the cooperatives constitutes five percent of the country's GNP. The basis of such a leap forward is the free labor of the free entrepreneur.

Economic Expert on Ruble Convertibility, Reforms

AU1004145690 Vienna DER STANDARD in German 7-8 Apr 90 p 20

[Unattributed report: "Ruble Will Become Convertible Currency as Late as in the Year 2000"]

[Text] Vienna—Revolutionary changes have taken place in Soviet foreign trade. This was stated by Vladimir Pankov, expert for central Europe at the Moscow World Economics Institute, in a lecture in Vienna on Thursday evening [5 April]. In addition, he said that, in his view, the ruble "could be a freely convertible currency in the year 2000 at the earliest."

The main goal of the reforms is to integrate the USSR into the world economy. So far this has not been the case, Pankov stressed. Even though the Soviet Union exports about 7.2 percent of its gross national product, it does not have any direct investments abroad. Furthermore, the export-import goods structure is very unfavorable. Deals of "crude oil for grain" are typical. In order to put an end to this, Moscow has given up the state monopoly in foreign trade, Pankov said.

Bad Experiences with Joint Ventures

In order to promote the interest of the enterprises, it has been permitted to use 10 to 15 percent of foreign currency income for the purchase of consumer goods for the enterprises staff; the rest is to be used for investments. However, there is a lack of knowledgeable personnel. "We would need about 50,000 trained traders for deals abroad," Pankov stressed.

Another step in the reform was the permission for joint ventures. At the moment, about 1,500 enterprises with foreign participations have been registered in the USSR. Austrian companies have shares in about 100 joint ventures.

However, experiences with joint ventures are anything but gratifying: Most exist only "on paper;" furthermore, the foreign companies mainly want to get secure state orders in the USSR and exclude competitors from the market. This does not particularly contribute to spreading an entrepreneurial way of thinking, Pankov stressed.

In addition, Pankov said that the idea of establishing special economic zones in the USSR is not particularly useful. There are plans to establish such duty-free zones near Leningrad and near the port of Nakhodka. However, it would be much too costly to protect them, and they would not have any synergetic effect on the USSR economy, Pankov explained.

Russian Agroindustrial Trade Unionists Meet

904F0107A WA0504193090 Moscow TRUD in Russian 15 Mar 90 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Platform Adopted"]

[Text] The first plenum of the republic committee of the workers' trade union of the Russian Agroindustrial Complex has been held.

The plenum was opened by M.B. Ryzhikov, chairman of the trade union central committee and AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] secretary, who emphasized that a process of consolidation is today underway with regard to the sovereignty and economic independence of republics. Actuality requires that we reconstitute the largest trade union in the country, assigned the task of protecting the interests of 18 million workers of Russian villages.

Election of the chairman of the trade union's Russian Committee took place on a competitive basis. Four contenders were nominated to the post, each of whom presented his program before the participants. But all the candidates agreed that the time has come in which a radical restructuring is necessary in work style and methods—a restructuring based on consolidation of the legal and financial independence of primary organizations and committees, on subordination of all echelons of the apparatus to elective organs, and on building relations with departments on terms of an equal-rights partnership.

Following a vote by secret ballot, A.S. Davydov, deputy chairman of the trade union central committee, was elected chairman of the Russian Committee.

The plenum adopted a platform for the Congress of Trade Unions of Russia and called upon branch trade unions of the republic to support it.

Draft Provisions on Small Business Explained

PM0604102990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Interview with D. Levchuk, chief of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Economic Reform, and V. Vologzhin, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Economic Reform Questions, by V. Romanyuk: "Small Enterprises Emerging from the Giants' Shadows"—no place or date of interview given; first paragraph is an introduction]

[Text] The Presidential Council's first sitting noted that an important part in the radicalization of perestroyka processes is to be played by flexible forms of economic management coupled with the rational development of small enterprises on the basis of cooperative principles, family enterprise, and cooperation with foreign firms and banks. The USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Economic Reform and the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Economic Reform Questions have pooled their efforts in work on a draft resolution "On Measures for the Development of Small Enterprises." D. Levchuk, chief of the State Commission Secretariat, and V. Vologzhin, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee, share their views on the development prospects for small firms in our economy.

Question: Let us make this clear from the outset. A small enterprise does not simply mean small in terms of employee numbers and volume of output produced, it actually means a completely new structure. Like a state enterprise, it enjoys supply and marketing guarantees and, like a cooperative, it is free to distribute its income and set its prices, it is not tied to the numerous other state sector regulations. Are you in favor of such a symbiosis of the two forms of economic management?

D. Levchuk: We have studied IZVESTIYA "roundtable" material about small state enterprises. I personally would give priority to nonstate structures. In principle, however, all forms must be equal. The fundamental point is that we are creating a sphere operating in market conditions and according to market laws. It should not be run by state edict, like the state sector today.

Question: Are we therefore talking about "small business" in the USSR?

D. Levchuk: We are talking about entrepreneurial activity. It is possible in conditions of a functioning market, but it is impossible under an administrative edict system. In principle, a market structure can be set up within two years. But this would require the creation of what I would call normal civilized conditions for the development of enterprise. The new legislative acts should eliminate any obstacles blocking the path of healthy enterprise. A rigid system of prohibitions encourages enterprising people to switch to the "shadow" economy. The first few representatives of "small business" suffer from extortion by many of those on whom their activity depends. It is therefore important to transfer sufficient resources and investment funds to this sphere right at the initial stage, to create most-favored status for small firms.

Question: There is a lot of talk in the West today about the "privatization" of small business. Does it not follow from our conversation that we are also going in the direction of setting up a great multitude of "private stalls?"

D. Levchuk: The draft government resolution envisages the right of every citizen to set up, subject to permission by the local soviet, an enterprise based on personal ownership; moreover, the number of persons working under labor contracts should not exceed 10. You could describe this as a "private stall." The problem of social guarantees for workers in private enterprises arises at once. Estonia already has a procedure whereby a "private" or joint stock enterprise can be registered given the existence of an initial capital of...R3,000.

Question: Does this mean that this question can also be decided at republic level?

V. Vologzhin: It can but, naturally, within the framework of union legislation. A draft law on joint stock corporations and other partnerships is specifically under preparation. The differences lie primarily in the extent of liability. An owner is liable to the full extent of his property. In a joint stock corporation, liability is limited to the value of the shares held by the shareholder—this is the main attraction of the joint stock form. But competition and the movement of capital can begin only within a full-blooded market system.

D. Levchuk: The movement of capital is an important feature of a market economy. Using the medium of securities, stock exchanges pump capital in the required direction. Small business in the United States is served by 11,000 commercial banks. We lack such a system. Enterprises' uncommitted accounts now hold more than R100 billion and this capital is not "working" in any way. Nobody should be blamed for this: We lack market structure elements like commodity and stock exchanges and a securities market. Never mind the middlemen—investment and audit firms, brokerage companies. Nonetheless, the creation of a network of small firms is a first and necessary step toward a lively market.

Question: Many economists agree that the process of destatization of ownership would reduce the state sector to 30 percent of the total potential. Does this not mean that we are about to live through a stage when giants are broken down and small enterprises emerge from their ruins?

V. Vologzhin: Not quite. The first to leave would be those which were automatically incorporated into associations. On the whole, however, it is impossible to solve the question by leaving some as giants while others are turned into dwarfs. Everything should be determined by expediency. The problem lies elsewhere: In essence, two-thirds of our enterprises are small but have not yet acquired full autonomy and cannot utilize the advantages of small forms. The first task in the transition to the market is to detach this part from administrative structures. But even these 30,000 enterprises would not be enough to lay the market's foundation. This would require the creation of 300,000 and possibly even 3 million new small enterprises.

Question: But real life demonstrates a diametrically opposite approach—new structures are being created, like associations and amalgamations which swallow literally wholesale enterprises which until only yesterday were autonomous. Where are the small ones to come from?

D. Levchuk: It would be naive to expect rapid growth of new structures once the administrative structure is demolished. In reality, such hopes have already produced chaos. After all, we have not altered the systems of economic legislation, planning, and distribution of resources—new structures continue to perform past functions. This is logical in conditions when the market's absence is accompanied by acute shortages. A market cannot emerge from the old system's ruins. I think that it is necessary to begin on a small scale, by switching several tens of thousands of small enterprises to a market regime system, without touching the giants which will remain in the state sector. The example of cooperatives proves that the new shoots will thrive. In just two years, and in conditions of tough pressure, the number of cooperatives has reached 200,000 with a production volume of R40 billion. Such enterprises take shape quickly, absorbing everything that is new in the technological sphere and finding it easy to adapt to market demands. The giants—these "capitalist sharks"—certainly do not swallow small enterprises elsewhere in the world. On the contrary, small firms actually feed the giants. Small firms in the United States either cooperate closely with concerns, or are economically independent and dominate local markets, or supply the market with new types of goods and services.

Question: Is there not a "boom" of small firms now under way in our country? The USSR Union of Small Enterprises unites more than 1,000 members and several associations. Next in line is the creation of an "incubator" to promote the development of small firms....

V. Vologzhin: So far there has been no "boom." During a recent trip to the United States we studied the activity of small business and were discouraged when we realized how far behind we are. The United States has 19 million autonomous firms, while the giants account for no more than two percent of the total number. Basically, it is small business which accounts for almost half of the national product growth and for two-thirds of new jobs growth. Small business in that country operates in the spheres of services, processing, and brokerage and is breaking into science-intensive sectors. We asked: What is it that drives it along? And we concluded: powerful state support.

Question: Subsidies?

V. Vologzhin: Not only subsidies. Suffice it to say that the U.S. Congress has two committees dealing with the problems of small business. All the state structures involved in this have a total of 4,500 staffers. They are headed by the Small Business Administration whose apparatus has 1,100 staffers. Their main function is to support small business which is, in principle, exceptionally sensitive to even the slightest market fluctuation. Each state has regional divisions staffed by 30-40 peoples. Neither central nor regional functionaries issue edicts to small business, they only respond to every request and supply information on market conditions. They also produce feasibility studies on suggestions by anyone who intends to launch a business.

D. Levchuk: The support system in the United States includes the following components. First, direct budget subsidies. These amount to about $300 million a year in total. This is a small amount and is mainly meant to cover losses against which small business cannot obtain insurance. Subsidies cover risk projects of an innovative nature and stimulate the manufacture of output in which big business is simply not interested. Second, when placing orders with giant firms, the state stipulates a mandatory percentage of orders which the giants must pass on to small business (something along the lines of our subcontracting). Third, the state acts as guarantor for bank loans. This is why a small entrepreneur, or one who is just beginning, finds it relatively easy to obtain credit. Incidentally, support for small business is also provided by their association. For example, we visited a firm manufacturing starter motors for cars. Not a large firm, but it belongs to an association of 550,000 small enterprises and enjoys its protection in political, state, and other structures. Fourth, small business enjoys tax advantages. The total tax payable amounts to 44 percent of income (36 percent in national taxes and eight percent in state taxes). The taxable amount can be reduced if the firm increases its investment in the social sphere or in production development.

Question: Given the state support, how do you explain the mass bankruptcy? Here are some statistics: Some 40 percent of small enterprises in the United States go out of business in their first year, and 30 percent in their second year.

D. Levchuk: These are not necessarily bankruptcies. If a business does not produce sufficient profit, the entrepreneur is entitled to start over. And he will again receive the state support he needs. Incidentally, there are many useful features in the forms of support for small enterprises in Bulgaria, Hungary, and the GDR. They include the setting up of central state funds for the purchase of "know-how" and licenses for advanced technologies, priority for small enterprises in the acquisition of means for production retooling, and cooperation with Western firms.

Question: How about our country? Could I launch my own newspaper tomorrow?

D. Levchuk: The first thing you will be told is that you are not allowed to engage in entrepreneurial activity. Then you will be told that nobody will allow you to produce printed matter. You are hardly likely to obtain credit to purchase suitable equipment, especially in view of the existing prohibitions on the sale of copying equipment in private hands. This is why we built into the draft resolution on small enterprises not just the idea of equality of all forms of economic management but also an opportunity enabling every average honest person to launch his own business. Every Soviet citizen must have the right to engage in entrepreneurial activity. Under current legislation, even a cooperative member needs outstanding go-getting qualities to avoid getting bogged down in the morass of prohibitions.

V. Vologzhin: It is necessary to begin by creating a broad legislative base. Incidentally, the package of draft laws on taxation envisages tax advantages for small enterprises. At the same time, it is necessary to legislatively solve questions associated with the setting up of small enterprises based on personal ownership by citizens—private, family, or joint stock enterprises—as well as on a combination of different forms of ownership (collective-state). This would require amplifications to individual articles and provisions of the laws on the state enterprise, the cooperative system, and individual labor activity, the Fundamentals of Civil Law, and the legislation on leasing. The singling out of shops for the creation of small enterprises would also require amplifications to a whole package of laws.

Question: Can our economy be expected to produce its own businessmen and independent entrepreneurs in the near future?

D. Levchuk: This will happen if all the proposals are accepted. Entrepreneurs already exist in the cooperative system, but for the time being the bulk of them are to be found in the "shadow" economy.

V. Vologzhin: In this context I would note the package of proposals on the basic principles of entrepreneurial activity worked out by the scientific-industrial group of USSR people's deputies. Their primary demand is to boost the status of entrepreneurial activity subject to strict social guarantees for the population. It is further proposed to review price levels, labor remuneration, taxes, and state subsidies, to legislatively ensure the development of healthy competition, and to create conditions for free organization of enterprises involving different forms of ownership. In parallel with the taxation of incomes and profits, it is proposed to restore the taxation of property (property taxes) which, according to the draft's authors, will ensure a transition from administrative to economic methods for the elimination of economic mismanagement and inefficient utilization of property. To put it briefly, an entrepreneur must enjoy guaranteed freedom from any apparatus directives which do not comply with the law. We are talking about creating conditions for people to demonstrate initiative and innovative potential.

Production, Socioeconomic Data Examined

904D0087A Moscow TRUD in Russian 25 Mar 90 p 1

[Report by V. Kuzmishchev: "Do Not Expect a Miracle. Reflections on the Regular Report of the State Committee for Statistics"]

[Text] **When pouring through the debris of figures, one more alarming than the next, it is not easy to rise above them and see how, in spite of everything, new shoots which hold the future, however timidly, are pushing their way through. We are speaking about the figures of the USSR State Committee for Statistics, which characterize the country's socioeconomic development for January-February of this year.**

The national income produced decreased by one percent as compared to January-February of last year, and contractual discipline has not improved. One could give dozens of reasons for the decline, both subjective and objective, but just a couple of figures will suffice. In January-February, because of the strikes and mass absences from work related to interethnic conflicts, loss of working time amounted to 9.1 million man-days, while for the whole of last year only 7.3 million man-days were lost. A daily average of 200,000 people failed to work for this reason. How can we speak of dynamics of development or obligatory deliveries. We have become accustomed to strikes as we have to empty shelves in stores, although a half year ago events like this seemed extraordinary.

In the autumn a law on the procedure for resolving collective labor conflicts was adopted and in the winter, as you can see, the number of strikes increased. We do not have leasing yet, although the law concerning it was adopted like some kind of miracle drug that would cure the ills of our economy. In a word, our eternal hope in prescriptions from above that will change everything immediately is failing to justify itself once again.

The center of man's life aspirations has now shifted appreciably from production to social phenomena. And in a unique form. Progressive terms about free initiative and independence frequently mask a desire to get something for nothing. This is illustrated by the same figures. The monetary income of the population amounted to

R98.4 billion, and decreased as compared to January-February of last year by 7.3 percent. The growth rate of the monetary income of the population outstripped the growth rate of their expenditure on goods and services by a factor of 1.2.

What is the problem? Are earnings increasing too rapidly or are not enough goods being produced? Both. But the situation is much more alarming with the former. Government efforts are clearly inadequate to stop up the floodgates in the monetary flow. A recent meeting of the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium was devoted to this subject, at which examples were given of enterprises violating the procedure for forming material incentive funds without thinking twice about it: in violation of the norms, deductions from increments to prices with the index N are going into the material incentive fund; enterprises are turning part of their production volume over to cooperatives and reducing the wage fund by the same amount, receiving reduced assignments, and receiving unearned bonuses.

As before, estimated costs of planning and scientific developments are exaggerated shamelessly. At the meeting of the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium a case was cited in which the labor collective council of an institute, having "consulted," decided that payments would not exceed 25 salaries per year....

But still the advantages of independence for enterprises are considerable. The right to dispose of part of the produced product in their own way, to create joint enterprises, and to select the form of management should help to saturate the market with goods. The turning of the national economy to "face man" envisioned by the program for improving the economy can be seen in the results of the first two months. The production of consumer goods has increased fairly sharply—by 6.3 percent as compared to the first six months of last year—and the volume of retail commodity turnover and paid services has increased by R8.8 billion. The production of washing machines increased by 14 percent, sewing machines and color television sets by 13 percent, and the output of soap, irons, notebooks and many other goods in short supply has also increased. This inspires hope. If only the weak shoots do not wither away in the shade of the dying trees.

Why are we not noticing these positive changes in our activity?

Because in order to eliminate the deficit it is necessary to produce much more even than at the time when they were in abundance. The example of tea is instructive in this connection. The increase in its delivery is very high—22 percent—but in many regions they have had to sell it with coupons as before. What is the reason for this? Are people storing it up? Is it advantageous to someone to have an artificial deficit? In any case it is not because there is no tea in the country.

Since we have touched upon food products, here the figures correspond to our irritation about the empty store shelves. During January-February trade failed to receive R1.2 billion worth of food products. The deliveries increased somewhat compared to last year, but we can see and the State Committee for Statistics understands that this is clearly not enough.

Prices in the markets have also skyrocketed correspondingly: for meat and lard—by 15 percent, vegetables—13 percent, and fruits—12 percent. Perhaps those who have managed to increase their earnings severalfold are able to afford this, but so far they are in the minority.

Speaking of market relations in the economy, opponents of this method are frightened by the terrible phrase "market chaos." So far we do not have a real, healthy market, but the chaos is in evidence. Perhaps a more energetic turn in the direction of the market will reduce this.

Some Improvement in Rail Freight Handling

PM0504113590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 Apr 90 First Edition p 1

["Keeping an Eye on the Situation" article by A. Kapkov: "Daylong Breaks"]

[Text] The editorial office was informed by the USSR Ministry of Railways Freight Handling Department that by the end of the first quarter the alarming situation on the country's railroads, which has been described more than once by our paper, had been rectified somewhat. The breakthrough came in March. The number of freight cars waiting to be unloaded fell from 35,000 to 21,000. Supplies of foodstuffs and consumer goods to cities and oblasts have improved. Nevertheless, the situation in station and enterprise sidings remains serious. What is the experts' freight handling forecast?

First and foremost, both the transport workers and their customers note the timeliness of the USSR Council of Ministers resolution "On Introducing a Fivefold Fine for Freight Cars That Stand Idle for Longer Than the Prescribed Unloading Time." Nevertheless, it cannot be said that this emergency economic measure has solved the problem completely. According to the most modest estimates, in March alone more than 10,000 freight cars a day were not being unloaded, because the customers were disorganized. All records for misuse of rolling stock were broken in Maritime Kray. They are failing to unload 800 freight cars a day there. On the Moscow Railroad there are 600 freight cars standing around day after day; the figure is not much smaller in Stavropol Kray, and in the environs of Leningrad and Rostov-na-Donu it is nearly 400....

As in the past, the congestion is due to inefficient freight handling. Freight cars destined for the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Ministry of Trade, Central Union of Consumer Societies, light industry, and Ministry of Grain Products stand waiting for weeks. Unloading and dispatch of containers (and it is they that bring the consumer goods) falls off very dramatically on weekends and holidays. For example, only half the number of containers are dispatched on those days in Rostov Oblast; only one-fourth in Khabarovsk Kray; 23 percent in Ryazan Oblast; and 20 percent in Volgograd Oblast.

Many cities, such as Chelyabinsk, Kazan, Gorkiy, and others, have been literally hoarding, because of an abundance of goods. The following picture was typical: In the first half of the day all would be quiet in station and enterprise sidings, and then the mad rush would begin. In the RSFSR as a whole, only one-third of the freight cars are unloaded at night, although many more can and must be unloaded.

The biggest losses during unloading take place at ports, where the tracks are clogged with rolling stock. Every day more than 2,000 freight cars do not get unloaded at wharves. For more than 40 days 200 gondola cars carrying TR brand coal, destined for sale abroad, but rejected by the foreign party, have lain abandoned at Nakhodka station and in its sidings. What is supposed to happen to the substandard coal? Really, the coal workers should have adopted urgent measures and learned a lesson from the deal that did not come off. But the first batch of rejected coal was immediately followed by the arrival of another two trains at Posye station, which made the freight handling situation even worse.

The so-called transshipment of 110 freight cars carrying automatic equipment for Kamchatka has been unable to take place for 45 days at the port of Vladivostok. But the Kamchatka Steamship Company is in no hurry to send ships to the port, despite urgent telegrams from the railroad workers. Rolling stock carrying timber has gotten stuck at the ports of Nakhodka and Vanino. Timber for papermaking is held up at the wharves of Kaliningrad. But there are no ships hastening there.

The congestion at the river port of Osetrovo, on the Lena, must also be mentioned. In accordance with a USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply target, freight has been arriving there, since the winter, for Yakutia and northern parts of Irkutsk Oblast. But the river port was not ready to receive the freight. If this continues, the East Siberian Railroad will soon be paralyzed, in the full sense of the word.

Agricultural

CPSU CC Panel Discusses Rural Construction

PM0904125190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Apr 90 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Session of CPSU Central Committee Commission on Questions of Agrarian Policy"]

[Text] As already reported, a routine session of the CPSU Central Committee [CC] Commission on Questions of Agrarian Policy has been held under the chairmanship of Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The session discussed questions connected with the development of housing and sociocultural construction in villages of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] in the light of the CPSU Central Committee March (1989) Plenum's decisions and with the improvement of peasants' living conditions. Reports were delivered by A.A. Babenko, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, and Yu.M. Khusainov, first deputy chairman of the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers.

The speakers noted that the growth rate of capital investments in developing the social and cultural complex in the countryside has increased in the current five-year plan, with 16 percent growth in Russia and 39 percent in Belorussia. More housing, schools, clubs, and medical establishments have been commissioned than ever. The growth in highway construction has been particularly great. Nevertheless, the social reorganization of the countryside remains one of the most acute problems.

Ye.S. Stroyev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, V.V. Nikitin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Food and Purchases, A.M. Masaliyev, first secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee, A.F. Ponomarev, first secretary of the Belgorod CPSU Obkom [Oblast Committee], N.F. Tatarchuk, first secretary of the Kalinin CPSU Obkom, D.K. Motornyy, chairman of the Kirov Kolkhoz in Kherson Oblast, and others stressed during the exchange of opinions that a number of regions are still not taking sufficient measures to ensure the priority development of the social sphere in the countryside and are slow to build housing and cultural and everyday facilities.

This situation is leading to a reduction in the size of the rural population and is aggravating the cadre problem in the extreme. In the past 10 years the rural population has declined by 3.2 million in Russia and 776,000 in Belorussia.

In 1989 rural housing construction plans were not met in Astrakhan, Murmansk, and Perm Oblasts and the Chuvash ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]. The commissioning of housing in Leningrad and Pskov Oblasts has fallen compared with 1985. In many Russian oblasts and autonomous republics, the construction of housing using the population's resources is not being developed and the plan for the commissioning of preschool institutions has not been fulfilled—the provision of them in Belorussia is one-half of the norm.

The unsatisfactory material and technical support for construction is the factor holding back the development of the rural social sphere. The USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] sets unjustifiably low norms for material expenditure by unduly increasing the economy targets and reducing the norms for production reserves.

Society must understand that the country can only achieve sufficiency in food if production relations in the countryside are radically improved and if the peasant is given adequate technical and social provision. In this regard the rural worker must show the utmost independence and initiative so that he really is the master of the land.

The commission instructed the RSFSR and Belorussian SSR Gosagroproms [State Agro-Industrial Committees] and also the Gosplan, the Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply], the Gosstroy [State Committee for Construction], and the State Committee for Architecture and Town Planning of the USSR, and other ministries and departments not just to say that they are giving priority to the development of the social infrastructure in the countryside but to actually do so. Special attention here should be paid to developing the base of the construction industry and local construction materials, increasing the production of bricks, reinforced concrete, and joinery materials, and to more fully satisfying the demand for cement, metal, and sanitary engineering and heating equipment. The idea of widely involving industrial ministries in creating production facilities for the manufacture of equipment for the production of materials and structures to be used in rural construction was stressed.

Telegrams and letters are being received from oblasts and republics about disruptions in the supply of materials and equipment to kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and peasant farms. Agriculture is suffering great losses and in a number of places the optimum time for field work is being missed. In this connection the commission felt it necessary that the session hear a report from P.I. Mostovoy, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gossnab, on questions of material and technical supply to the agro-industrial complex. Numerous facts were cited providing evidence of the most flagrant violations of state discipline regarding the supply of equipment, mineral fertilizers, and fuels and lubricants. They were supplemented and concretized in the speeches of I.K. Polozkov, first secretary of Krasnodar CPSU Kray Committee, and V.M. Vildmanov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Gosagroprom.

Communist leaders of USSR ministries and departments were instructed to adopt cardinal measures to eliminate the shortcomings noted in material and technical supply to the agro-industrial complex.

In his closing address Ye.K. Ligachev stressed that the questions under discussion are of an exceptionally important—social—character. All the legal preconditions for their solution have been created and are enshrined in the USSR Supreme Soviet laws on ownership, land, and leasing. They have been supported by workers in agriculture and its processing and service sectors. And it is very important to strengthen the material and technical base of the agro-industrial complex as quickly as possible and create the necessary social conditions in the countryside.

The most important thing is to considerably increase the production of bricks, wooden and reinforced concrete structures, and finishing materials. There is an even more acute question as well—namely, to produce autonomous units for heating houses and sanitary engineering equipment for them. It was noted that the priority area of new construction in the countryside is toward farmstead-type houses complete with all the buildings required for running a family farm.

There should be support for and widespread dissemination of the experience of design and construction associations, which, by combining planning and the production and installation of structural components, make it possible to considerably reduce the process from the planning of facilities to their commissioning on a turnkey basis. Attention was drawn to improving the activity of party organizations in collectives of construction workers and planners and at enterprises producing construction materials and goods.

The commission members visited an exhibition of design studies of USSR Gosstroy scientific research organizations involved in the comprehensive architectural planning of new construction in the countryside.

Military

Collegium Discusses Draft Defense Law

LD1004120490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1025 GMT 10 Apr 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 10 Apr (TASS)—For the first time, a USSR law on defense is being drawn up in the Soviet Union. A meeting of the Collegium of the USSR Ministry of Defense, which took place today, was devoted to discussing a draft of this law. The collegium is the main collective body of the Ministry of Defense, headed by the defense minister. Most important issues pertaining to the life of the armed forces are discussed by the collegium. USSR deputy defense ministers are collegium members.

Taking into account the importance of the issue under discussion for the country in general, USSR people's deputies, representatives of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Issues of Defense and State Security, senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the USSR State Planning Committee, the USSR Committee for State Security, the USSR Ministry of Justice, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the USSR Academy of Sciences—over 120 people altogether—were invited to attend today's collegium meeting.

To prepare a draft law, a military-legislative commission of the USSR Ministry of Defense, headed by Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, was set up earlier. It includes military commanders, specialists in various fields of military science, scientists, and lawyers.

What is today's concept of the USSR Law on Defense? The participatns in the meeting agreed that the law has to become the long-term legal foundation for military construction, and the core of the entire system of the USSR defense legislation.

"The legal status of the armed forces, the principles of their formation, and the procedure for serving in the Army have to be fixed in the law," Army General Moiseyev stressed in an interview with the TASS correspondent. He added that the construction of the armed forces is to be conducted on the basis of cadres in accordance with the principles of centralization of leadership, legality, combined command and democratisation of service relations.

The collegium instructed the military-legislative commission to elaborate the draft law, taking into account the proposals and remarks made at the collegium meeting, and submit it to the USSR Supreme Soviet in accordance with the established procedure.

Zaykov, Yazov Attend Air Defense Forces Meeting

PM1004075190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Apr 90 First Edition p 1

[Unnamed correspondent report: "In Honor of Air Defense Forces Day"]

[Text] A ceremonial meeting devoted to Air Defense Forces Day was held at the Central House of the Soviet Army 6 April.

In the presidium of the meeting were L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Army General D.T Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense; I.S. Belousov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; O.S. Belyakov, head of a CPSU Central Committee department; Army General D.S. Sukhorukov, USSR deputy defense minister; Lieutenant General V.I. Grebenyuk, deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; V.I. Kuznetsov, secretary of Moscow CPSU City Committee; generals, admirals, officers, and veterans of the Air Defense Forces; working people of the defense industry; and representatives of Moscow's public.

The meeting was addressed by Army General I.M. Tretyak, commander in chief of the Air Defense Forces and USSR deputy defense minister.

Yazov Hails Forces

PM1004074990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Apr 90 First Edition p 1

["USSR Defense Minister's Order of the Day No. 136"; dated Moscow, 8 April 1990]

[Text] Comrade soldiers and sailors, sergeants and petty officers, ensigns and warrant officers, officers, generals, and admirals!

Comrade veterans of the Air Defense Forces!

Comrade designers and working people in the defense industry!

I greet and congratulate you on the festival—Air Defense Forces Day!

The Air Defense Forces have traveled a combat path from the first antiaircraft batteries which defended the young Soviet Republic to a branch of the USSR Armed Forces equipped with the most modern hardware. They inscribed many heroic pages in the annals of the Great Patriotic War and made a worthy contribution to winning the victory over the fascist aggressors.

At the present time the Air Defense Forces are vigilantly keeping combat watch and honorably fulfilling their military duty. Intensive combat and political training is under way in combined units and units. Under conditions of democratization and glasnost the effectiveness of educational work in multinational military collectives is increasing, and the personnel's initiative and creativity aimed at further improving the qualitative indicators of combat readiness and strengthening military discipline are being enhanced.

The officers, ensigns, sergeants, and soldiers of the Air Defense Forces are keeping and augmenting the glorious combat traditions of the older generations of the socialist homeland's defenders and, together with the servicemen of other branches and categories of troops of the USSR Armed Forces, ensuring favorable peaceful conditions for resolving the tasks of the revolutionary restructuring of Soviet society and the renewal of socialism, and are reliably defending peace on earth.

I wish the personnel of the Air Defense Forces, veterans, and working people of the defense industry successes in service, in educating patriots and internationalists, and in labor for the good of our great motherland—the USSR.

To mark Air Defense Forces Day I order:

That a festive firework display be held today, 8 April 1990, at 2200 hours local time, in the hero-city of Moscow, the capital of our motherland, in the capitals of the union republics, in the hero-cities of Leningrad, Volgograd, Odessa, Sevastopol, Novorossiysk, Kerch, Tula, Smolensk, and Murmansk, and in the hero-fortress of Brest.

Army General D. Yazov, USSR minister of defense.

Soviet Officer on Troop Withdrawal From Hungary

AU0504125590 Budapest MAGYAR HIRLAP in Hungarian 4 Apr 90 pp 1,3

[Report on interview with Colonel General Matvey Burlakov, commander of the Soviet Southern Army Group, by Csaba Poor; place not given, on 3 April: "The Generals Did Not Oppose It"]

[Excerpts] Some 166 tanks, 212 trucks and mortars, a total of 1,354 people, 123 officers, 53 ensigns, 936 conscripts, two civilian employees, and some 250 family members left Hungary on 16 military trains on 3 April [figures as published]. The withdrawal of Soviet troops is going according to schedule —Matvey Burlakov, the government commissioner in charge of the Soviet troops stationed in Hungary, said in an interview granted to MAGYAR HIRLAP on the eve of 4 April.

[Poor] Not so long ago, hardly one and a half years ago, during an interview with MAGYAR HIRLAP, a high-ranking Soviet general firmly rejected even the idea of Soviet troops withdrawing from Hungary, and said that the Warsaw Pact had already made enough unilateral concessions to NATO. Now, after a few months of negotiations, the final withdrawal of Soviet troops has begun. One can easily have the impression that the decision has been made exclusively by the politicians, and, had it been for the generals, the Soviet troops would continue to be deployed in Hungary.

[Burlakov] No, this is not so. Before making such a decision, the political leaders naturally consult the Army, and the soldiers expressed their opinions in this case too.

As for the complete withdrawal of Soviet troops from the territory of the Hungarian Republic, we discussed this matter even before 1989. As early as in 1985, the Soviet Union proposed withdrawing foreign troops from Europe by 1995-96, and eliminating every foreign military base by the turn of the century. The partial troop withdrawal carried out in several East European countries in 1989 served this goal. [passage omitted]

[Poor] Does that mean that you no longer fear upsetting the balance of forces in Europe?

[Burlakov] The troops to be withdrawn from Hungary represent a considerable army group trained for action under modern conditions. This army group consists of almost 50,000 soldiers, some 27,000 units of combat technology, including more than 800 tanks, 1,200 armored vehicles, more than 250 airplanes and helicopters, and also 560,000 tonnes of various military and equipment and fuel.

From a purely military point of view, the withdrawal of such an army group naturally upsets the balance of forces, all the more so because NATO had an advantage in southern Europe even before the withdrawal. However, we take it into consideration that, nowadays, the security of a country can be guaranteed today not only by military means, but also by political ones. The Soviet Union does not intend to solve international problems by military means today or in the future. In this area, we count on positive steps in response from NATO. [passage omitted]

[Poor] Thus, the staff of generals did not come up with any opposition to this withdrawal?

[Burlakov] No, and they will not oppose it in the future either. [passage omitted]

[Poor] Do you think your relations with the population in Hungary have always been good?

[Burlakov] As a whole, our relations with the population have been good. Naturally, there are always problems where there are young people together. For instance, we had cases of traffic accidents that threw a bad light on us at one time. However, I think we have no reasons to doubt our friendship. [passage omitted]

[Poor] How much does this withdrawal cost, and who will cover the expenses?

[Burlakov] The expenses incurred in maintaining our troops are entirely covered by the Soviet Government. We allocate 300 million transferable rubles for this annually, which is more than 6.5 billion forints. We spent close to 2 billion forints annually only to maintain and renew the assets of the Southern Army Group, and the various services cost us more than 1 billion forints annually, and the railway transportation cost us 234 million forints. I could continue the list of expenses. For transportation, we pay from the Soviet Defense Ministry budget and through foreign trade.

We have set up various installations on our own. Their value stands at several tens of billions of forints. Thus, we built 370 blocks of flats with 14,500 apartments, more than 100 military barracks with 17,000 places, 70 canteens for 24,000 people, and many other installations. Many organizations, cooperatives, and firms are interested in these installations. We have also received offers to buy part of our technical installations, various installations, hospitals, and schools. Naturally, we will hand over everything we have been renting from the Hungarian Government, in accordance with the existing agreements. [passage omitted]

Baltic Republics

Vilnius Radio Carries 10 Apr Council Session

Agenda Announced

LD1004092690

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0700 GMT on 10 Apr begins carrying a live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

The deputy in the chair announces that today's agenda would include an agreement to the provisional basic law and the government law, a draft law on the republic's coat of arms, and the problem of the deputy's status.

At 0713 GMT at the request of the corresponding commission, it is agreed that the amendment to the basic law and the government law will be debated at the end of today's session.

At 0708 GMT the Mandate and Ethics Commission presents a report on the mandates of the newly elected deputies. The commission's chairman presents the newly elected deputies. Among the elected deputies is engineer Pirozhkov from the Snieckus constituency. The session confirms the mandates of these deputies.

At 0714 GMT it is announced that the next item on the agenda is the debates on the republic's coat of arms. The session is adjourned until 0745 GMT.

Coat of Arms Debated

LD1004094490

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0745 GMT on 10 April resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

At 0745 GMT Deputy Ilgunas submits a report on the project of the republican coat of arms. He reads a draft law on the coat of arms.

At 0755 GMT questions are put to Deputy Ilgunas. There has been a dispute in the commissions on which model for the coat of arms should be used; there are two models by two different artists.

At 0806 GMT a vote is taken on the law of the coat of arms. It is adopted by a majority of votes.

At 0807 GMT discussion begins on the next item on the agenda: the status and working conditions of the deputy. Deputy Sadreika presents a report on this problem.

At 0821 GMT debates take place on this issue. They deal mostly with various payments to the deputies and privileges, such as the free use of various means of transport, with the exception of a taxi.

At 0848 GMT debates continue. The deputy in the chair reminds the deputies that this problem has been already debated more than once and that the decision which will be taken by the deputies will only be a temporary one.

At 0917 GMT a vote was taken on individual articles and on their amendments in the resolution.

At 0928 GMT the session adjoured for 20 minutes.

Vote on Amendments Taken

LD1004114190

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0950 GMT on 10 April resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius. Voting on amendments and on individual articles in the resolution continues.

At 1009 GMT after a prolonged debate, a vote is taken to revoke the previous decision on the first two articles in the resolution on payments to the deputies and it is decided to continue discussion. This motion concerning the first article in the resolution is rejected by a majority of votes. It is decided to postpone the decision because there is no quorum.

At 1018 GMT Landsbergis takes the floor to make a statement on the proposal sent to Gorbachev by the Soyuz groups suggesting that the results of the elections to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet be declared invalid and the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet be dissolved. Landsbergis says he intends to send a message to Gorbachev on this issue. Debates begin on whether such a message is necessary. The message is not read, but copies are distributed to all deputies. The question arises whether this message should be sent by Landsbergis personally or in his capacity as chairman of the Supreme Council. A proposal is made that this message should be sent on behalf of the Presidium of the Supreme Council. The issue is left open, to be decided by its chairman. No decision is made.

At 1033 GMT once again the deputies begin debating the status and working conditions of the deputies. Voting on amendments and on individual articles takes place once more. They are adopted by a majority of votes. A vote is then taken on all the amendments. They are adopted by 91 votes in favor, six votes against, and four abstentions. A proposal is made that the whole resolution will be valid from 10 March 1990. A vote it taken and it is approved by a majority of votes.

At 1050 GMT a break is announced until 1200 GMT.

Status of Deputies Debated

LD1004134790

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1200 GMT on 10 April resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

At 1205 GMT debates on the law of the status of deputies of the Supreme Council take place.

at 1225 GMT discussion begins on amendments to the basic law of the republic concerning the status of deputies.

At 1300 GMT debate begins on specific articles of the draft law. The arguement centers around the issue of who the deputies represent: their electors or the Lithuanian nation.

At 1319 GMT debate begins on Article 2, which deals with the deputy's oath.

At 1330 GMT the session adjourns until 1400 GMT.

Debates Continue

LD1004165490

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1400 GMT on 10 April continues its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

Deputy Kumza argues that Western parliamentarians do not give oaths. He has nothing against it but the deputies' oath should not be linked with the authorization given to him by the electors.

At 1404 GMT debates on the deputy's oath continues. An unidentified deputy states that the oath is not necessary. According to him, only Fidel Castro has introduced an oath for his deputies. Several deputies oppose taking an oath.

At 1412 GMT discussion begins on the duration of the deputy's mandate. Most are concerned whether the mandate begins from the moment when the constituency commission confirms the election or when the mandate commission confirms it.

At 1419 GMT the next issue surfaces—the pursuance of a deputy's outside profession.

At 1427 GMT no comments are made when the deputy in the chair lists various individual articles mentioned only by numbers. Debates take place on some of these articles, among them, when a deputy can be arrested or when criminal proceedings can be initiated against him.

At 1440 GMT the deputies vote by a majority to introduce the deputies' oath. But they also vote that failure to take the oath does not have juridicial consequences.

At 1447 GMT a discussion on the text of the oath takes place. It will be adopted after amendments without voting.

At 1456 GMT debates on amendments to the provisional basic law and to the government law take place.

At 1508 GMT a vote is taken to introduce the deputies' oath into the government law. It is adopted by a majority vote.

At 1520 GMT various announcements are made.

At 1525 GMT the plenary session adjourns until 1200 GMT on 11 April.

Spokesman Says Moscow Considering 'Measures'

AU1004133990 Paris AFP in English 1310 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, April 10 (AFP)—Moscow is considering "economic, political and other measures" to cow Lithuania into retracting its independence declaration, President Mikhail Gorbachev's spokesman Arkadiy Maslennikov said Tuesday.

The statement came a day after Mr. Gorbachev's Presidential Council rejected signs of compromise by Lithuanian leaders and said their refusal to withdraw the March 11 declaration of independence was leading the republic into a "dead-end".

Mr. Gorbachev appealed 10 days ago to the rebel Baltic republic to withdraw the independence declaration. But Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis refused to budge, saying that "everything is negotiable except independence".

Mr. Maslennikov would not specify the economic sanctions under consideration, but ruled out the idea of a total blockade against Lithuania. Soviet oil and energy companies could cut off supplies to Lithuania, he said, adding: "This is not a threat but a warning".

Meanwhile the deputy minister for the merchant navy, Gennadiy Gerassimchuk, warned that if Lithuania seceded from the Soviet Union it would have to repay the cost of ships, the harbour facilities and shipyards of the Baltic port of Klaipeda.

Many of the port installations were bought from abroad with precious hard currency, and the deputy minister said Lithuania would have to pay for them in foreign currency.

But Moscow's war of nerves with Lithuania will not jeopardise Mr. Gorbachev's planned summit with President George Bush in June, according to Mr. Maslennikov, who said: "This danger does not exist."

The Lithuanian capital, Vilnius, was calm Tuesday, witnesses said, although the Presidential Council's rebuff caused a stir. The Lithuanian parliament was in session Tuesday and could reply later in the day, they said.

Lithuanian Ministry Protests to Gorbachev

LD1004114290 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 0000 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Summary] Staff members of a department at the Lithuanian Ministry of Internal Affairs have appealed to USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and Vadim Bakatin, minister of the Soviet Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD].

The staff members of the Lithuanian MVD protest the demonstration of force and the policy of intimidation which is being persued in Lithuania by the USSR MVD troops.

The appeal maintains that the Lithuanian MVD and its militia do not need any help in enforcing law and order.

Lithuanian Supreme Council Report on Elections

LD1004133190

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0708 GMT on 10 April, in the live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius, broadcasts a five-minute report by the chairman of the Mandate and Ethics Commission on the mandates of the newly elected deputies. The chairman reports on 7 April repeat elections to the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania took place in eight constituencies. "In three of them, Naujoji Vilnia, Lazdijai, and Zarasai rayons, not a single candidate obtained the required number of votes. Repeat elections will be held in these constituencies shortly". The chairman says that "in view of the fact that a complaint has been received about the violation of the election law in the 130th Kacergine constituency, the republican election commission has postponed the registration of the elected deputy. The complaint is being investigated".

The chairman announces that the following deputies have been elected and registered: Klemas Inta, Vytautas Kvietkauskas, Sergey Pirozhkov, and Zita Slicyte.

Landsbergis Sends Appeal to Gorbachev

LD1004223390 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] The chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, Vytautas Landsbergis, sent a telegram to the Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev today. The telegram runs as follows:

Esteemed President, we are very concerned that ultrarightist imperial [word indistinct] are compelling you to take a wrong step, to continue the wrongs of the 1940s in the Baltics. Do not further this (?please.) In the name of peace, justice, and concord on earth, do not do this.

Vytautas Landsbergis acquainted the Lithuanian MPs [members of parliament] with the text of his telegram to Mikhail Gorbachev as the Lithuanian parliament continued work today. The chairman of the parliament said that he had been incited to send the telegram after he had heard information about the sitting of the Soviet Presidential Council the day before.

The Presidential Council was discussing the situation in Lithuania as well as the visit by the Soviet parliamentarian group called Soyuz (?to) Lithuania.

Vytautas Landsbergis said he found the demands of the Soyuz group of Soviet MPs to be grounded on essentially fascist ideology. Certain Lithuanian MPs, however, expressed doubts whether Lithuania ought to react to the Moscow statement at all, to which Vytautas Landsbergis replied that he did not consider the information on the sitting of the Soviet Presidential Council insignificant. Rather, it was a bad omen, the chairman of the Lithuanian parliament said. It is a sign that the escalation of tension and violence in Lithuania will continue, Vytautas Landsbergis noted, pointing out that while the Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze was getting ready for this visit to Washington, certain signs of a thaw were felt in the Soviet attitude to Lithuania. But as soon as Shevardnadze had returned from Washington, escalation of tension became the Soviet stand again.

Vilnius on Prunskiene 9 Apr News Conference

LD1004171990 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 9 Apr 90

[Excerpts] The Lithuanian Government gave its first news conference today. It was held at the Council of Ministers right after the cabinet's sitting. [passage omitted]

According to Kazimieras Prunskiene, the official recognition of the cabinet is due on Wednesday and by that time the government has to outline the key direction of its activity. It was namely this issue that took the bulk of the time at the cabinet sitting today.

The three leaders of the government, the premier and her two deputies, decided which particular field each was going to supervise. In addition to the representational functions, the premier will head the economic, financial, and jurisdiction spheres, as well as Lithuania's foreign economic links. The Deputy Premier Algirdas Brazauskas will be in charge of the material production sphere, including supplies of material resources. The other deputy premier, Romualdas Ozolas, is entrusted with the spiritual side of society's life. The third deputy of Mrs. Kazimieras Prunskiene, who is still to be appointed, will have to deal with matters of municipal self-governing.

A few statistical data were released about the cabinet at the news conference. Exactly half of the 20-member-strong cabinet are non affiliated to any party, but there are eight members of the Lithuanian Communist Party, one Social Democrat and one Christian Democrat. [passage omitted]

The first sitting of the cabinet, which lasted four hours debated the structure of the government as well as other matters pertaining to its activity, say, whether the internal structure of a ministry should be departmental or that of separate branches as before. According to Kazimieras Prunskiene, preference seems to be given to ministries as associations of departments.

Speaking about the working conditions of the government, Romualdas Ozolas defined them as extremely difficult. Despite the pressure from outside, the main sphere of the government's activity must be settling internal problems. But the vital thing is to hold on until 20 May [date as heard] when the Soviet-American summit starts, Romualdas Ozolas said, because there are indications that preparations for the summit are not taking the course that could be defined as most beneficial to Lithuania.

Romualdas Ozolas pointed out to Radio Vilnius after the news conference that he saw the mission of the present government in laying the foundations for the existence of the future democratic state.

Vasilyev Criticizes Prunskiene Statement

LD1004191890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] Vilnius: At a session of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet which resumed its work yesterday, the deputies are discussing the new national emblem of the Lithuanian Republic and the draft law on enterprises which will be published after discussion. At the first news conference of the Lithuanian government, journalists were informed about establishing the cabinet ministers' functions and introduced to the concept of the government's program. Our correspondent Gennadiy Kolenov reports:

[Kolenov] Brazauskas, Sikorskas, Ozolas, Dobrovolskis, and Kazimiera Prunskiene, the prime minister, took part in this news conference. Answering the journalists' questions, in particular on what kind of a way out of the present situation is envisaged by the prime minister and how does she regard presidential rule, Kazimiera Prunskiene said:

[Begin Prunskiene recording] It was not just a Lithuanian crisis, it was also a crisis of the Soviet Union, Europe, and the world, because the very idea of the peoples' self-determination, of democratization of the USSR foreign policy, was rejected. We did not take part in creating the institute of presidential power in the Soviet Union, we did not take part in adopting the mechanism of secession which does not concern us, because we are restoring statehood and are not seceding from the Union, for we did not enter it. Therefore, on this basis, we are attempting not just to carry out consultations or a dialogue of a fragmentary nature from a distance, but to begin direct negotiations about recognition of an independent state by the Soviet Union. [end recording]

[Kolenov] And I asked Aleksandr Dmitriyevich Vasilyev, the USSR deputy general procurator, to comment on this statement by Prime Minister Prunskiene from a legal point of view.

[Begin Vasilyev recording] To date, the present day's realities are such that the Union, as a federative state, does exist and the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] continues to be one of the 15 sovereign republics of the Union. Therefore, in accordance with the USSR Constitution, in case of a divergence between the law of the republic and the law of the Union, the laws of the Union must operate unconditionally on the territory of the Lithuanian SSR in accordance with Article 74 of the USSR Constitution. It is regrettable that such statements continue to appear in spite of the clearly expressed position of the leadership and the higher legislative organs of the country. The law has been adopted and it should be compulsory for all the republics within the Soviet Union. [end recording]

Workers Send Anti-Sajudis Letter to Gorbachev

LD1004204490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1932 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 10 April (TASS)—"We, workers and office staff of the industrial enterprises of Soviet Lithuania, express resolute protest against the intervention of USSR people's deputies of the so-called interregional group into our lives. In all possible ways, the deputies support "Sajudis" which is seeking to split the country and to create a "Grand Lithuanian Principality" from the Baltic to the Black Sea", says a letter to USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev published today and signed by 41 members of staff of the 'Vilma' Production Association in the city of Vilnius.

The letter stresses that these deputies "having no idea about what is taking place here now, how the rights of USSR citizens are being trampled upon, how dissidents are being persecuted, and how people of non-indigenous nationality are becoming social outcasts" are giving advice and welcoming the "democracy" of the nationalists.

"The deputies who are advocating democracy," the letter says, "do not want to see that 'Sajudis' and its government are seeking to establish a new dictatorship here. Having seized the radio, television, and newspapers, they are issuing only information beneficial to themselves. They brand all those who disagree with them enemies of the people, and meanwhile the parliament is adopting laws under which they can be put in prison. The day is not far off when 'Sajudis' will want to declare itself the only ruling party of Lithuania. We demand objective coverage by Union television and other mass media of the events taking place here."

In conclusion the authors of the letter appealed to the USSR president "to take steps without delay and to introduce here a zone of presidential rule."

Reports Indicate Vilnius 'More or Less Quiet'

LD1104094690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 11 Apr 90

[Text] Jurate Valanciute reports: So far, today our public life is more or less quiet. There have been no reports of extreme events. The House of the Press is being guarded as before. There are no pickets. The Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party is also being guarded, only today the uninvited guards are without bayonets and automatic weapons.

Some facts from Moscow: The Lithuanian permanent mission has lost its government communication channel. However, Lithuanian representative Egidijus Bickauskas is unperturbed. According to him, not all embassies of foreign states use this means of communication.

A delegation of Lithuanian women, which is staying in Moscow, yesterday met representatives of the USSR Ministry of Defense. True, these representatives were not of the highest rank. Today the women's delegation visited the U.S. Embassy in Moscow and delivered a letter to Mrs. Bush.

Lithuanian Deputies' Mandate Issue Discussed

LD1104100190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 11 Apr 90

[Text] Jurate Valanciute reports: A meeting of the USSR people's deputies who have been elected in Lithuania is to take place this evening. I spoke to Deputy Academician Eduardas Vilkas:

[Vilkas] It will be the same topic: What can we do with our abolished yet unabolished mandates as deputies? There are two tendencies. One is that of the deputies themselves, that it is essential to act, and the second is that there is no need to do anything, that these mandates should not be used. You know about the decision of the Supreme Council. Everyone understands that it is essential to search for some bridges in order to start negotiations, and also to make use of these certificates. Obviously, they grant the right to enter the Kremlin. And it is not easy to enter the Kremlin, as is known.

[Valanciute] It is difficult to enter the Kremlin and it is not easy to talk, as has been shown by experience.

Ozolas on 'Crude Interference' of USSR Troops

LD1004113690 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 0000 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Excerpts] Assessing the actions of the Soviet Armed Forces in Lithuanian territory during the past weeks, Lithuanian Deputy Prime Minister Romualdas Ozolas said that these were a crude interference into the republic's internal affairs aimed at destabilizing the situation, demoralizing the public, and hampering the administration's work. Such actions are illegal, even from the point of view of Soviet jurisdiction, said Romualdas Ozolas. By their aggressiveness, these actions outstrip even the behavior of the Red Army in 1940. The Lithuanian deputy prime minister spoke on Lithuanian television last night. [passage omitted]

According to the deputy prime minister, hoping that negotiations with the leadership of the USSR would start soon was not realistic; unofficial talks, not necessarily with the top-ranking people of the USSR, are possible. [passage omitted]

According to Romualdas Ozolas, the negotiations are inevitable. The leadership of the Soviet Union, which has been orientated toward restructuring, sooner or later will want to negotiate with us. However, this does not mean that the president of the USSR would want to recognize our independence the way we want it to be recognised. However, the deputy prime minister stressed, everyone must know that there will be no discussions with anybody about renouncing our independence.

Forecasting oncoming events related to the issue of negotiations, Romualdas Ozolas said that the actions of the Armed Forces, which had become even more active during E. Shevardnadze's visit in the United States, indicate that there are forces in the USSR which could press for another, more productive sitting of the Presidential Council, to conclude with a decision on the introduction of USSR presidential rule in Lithuania; to follow the earlier sitting, which did not discuss the Lithuanian problem. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev Says Situation Not Irreversible

LD1004123790 Moscow TASS in English 1227 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 10 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev has described as an "adventure" the actions of the Lithuanian parliament, which proclaimed the republic's independence on March 11.

Responding to questions posed by delegates to the 21st Congress of the Young Communist League (Komsomol) today, Gorbachev stressed that he did not regard the situation in Lithuania as irreversible. He said that the Soviet leadership was trying to persuade Lithuanian authorities to cancel their resolutions.

Gorbachev believes that a referendum should be held on Lithuania's future. He expressed confidence that residents of the republic would favour an independence that incorporated active ties with all republics of the Soviet Union. This problem should be resolved by reforming the federation, not dividing it.

Responding to a question about the possibility of presidential rule in Lithuania, Gorbachev said that the country's leadership was trying to find a political solution to the problem. At the same time, he did not rule out the possibility of introducing presidential rule but only as an extreme measure, if the situation there develops into a civil conflict.

Presidential Spokesman on Lithuania, Summit

LD1004142990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1259 GMT 10 Apr 90

[TASS parliamentary correspondent reports from the Kremlin: "USSR President's Press Secretary on the Situation in Lithuania"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 10 Apr (TASS)—The main condition of a settlement of the situation in and around Lithuania is its return to the constitutional path. This was stated at a briefing held here today for Soviet and foreign journalists by Arkadiy Maslennikov, the USSR president's press secretary.

The country's leadership, he stressed, does not intend to renounce its policy toward a political settlement, "but, at the same time, it is obvious that both the president and the government possess sufficient authoritative powers to adopt other measures, should matters take an undesirable turn, to protect the Constitution and the rights and interests of Soviet citizens."

Whether or not Lithuania remains within the USSR is a matter for the Lithuanian people, the press secretary stressed. It is merely important that the decision should be reached within the framework of the USSR Constitution. "We hope that the Lithuanian people will realize the advantages of the constitutional path and the detrimental nature of the hasty, convulsive decisions that have been adopted by the Lithuanian leadership, which have led to the present crisis and are exacerbating the situation. Over the course of 30 days, about 80 legislative acts, decisions, and administrative enactments have been adopted already which directly contradict the Constitution and legislation of the USSR. This is a method of confrontation that leads nowhere," he said.

Speaking on the prospects for the development of economic links with Lithuania, Arkadiy Maslennikov expressed doubt in the possibility of preserving them at the present volume "in the event of an immediate break in political relations." This is in no way a matter of a blockade; many enterprises in other areas of the USSR simply are not convinced of the expediency of concluding new contracts with partners from Lithuania in conditions of its clearly emphasized aspiration to secede from the USSR." "At the same time," he stressed, "a break in economic links would turn out be a catastrophe for the republic itself. According to Soviet Government data, the switch by Lithuania to trade at world prices would cause it a deficit on a scale of R3.7 billion."

Replying to a question on possible "interstate talks," as Lithuania proposes, Arkadiy Maslennikov said such a proposal "does not correspond to reality. The USSR exists, and Lithuania is a part of it. In this Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, there is a Constitution and there are laws, including laws on the mechanism for seceding from the USSR. On the basis of these laws, talks with Lithuania are possible if it returns to basic positions."

Replying to a question from a U.S. correspondent as to whether events in Lithuania will not disrupt the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, the press secretary said: "I think there is no danger of a disruption of the summit in Washington because of events in Lithuania." He added that preparations for the meeting are proceeding normally. "There are certain difficulties, but in general they are going at full speed," Arkadiy Maslennikov said.

Pro-Moscow Lithuanian Gives News Conference

LD1004182690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1726 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] Vilnius, 10 Apr (TASS)—TASS correspondent Vladimir Kostrov reports:

The heightening of tension in Lithuania has been brought about by the unjustified and unlawful actions of the Supreme Soviet of this republic, which is openly moving towards confrontation both with the Soviet Union, and the USSR Constitution. Vladislav Shved, second secretary of the provisional Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party expressed this thought today at a news conference here for Soviet and foreign journalists.

In his view, uncertainty about the future is growing among the population of the republic. This particularly affects supporters of the Soviet federation, since the measures being taken by the USSR president and government with respect to the Lithuanian parliament, Shved thinks, are "insufficiently firm and consistent."

He said that the law recently adopted "on the identity card of the citizen of the Lithuanian republic," makes the receipt of such an identity card conditional upon the obligation "to observe the laws of the Lithuanian republic, respect the independence of its state, and its territorial integrity." However, people who have not signed such an obligation, as stated by the Lithuanian government, "place themselves outside the bounds of Lithuanian civil society and are without defense against negative legal, economic, and social consequences."

Touching on the current activity of the Lithuanian Communist Party, standing on the positions of the CPSU, Vladislav Shved noted that the mass media, "Sajudis, and the government of the republic are deliberately and purposefully seeking to denigrate it, and to set the whole Lithuanian people against it. The communists of this party in the first instance are experiencing political pressure and moral terror, and it is they in fact who are being driven from buildings of the rayon party committees.

"Confrontation with the Soviet Union," Vladislav Shved said, "is beneficial to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, which, faced with an imaginary 'threat' from Moscow, is seeking to consolidate the Lithuanian people and to convince it of the correctness and the need for its decisions, and to foist upon it the idea of universal well-being and prosperity in the event that Lithuania secedes from the Soviet Union."

Party Loyalist Views Lithuanian Situation

90UN1309A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Mar 90 First Edition p 1

[Interview with I.I. Kuolyalis conducted by N. Nadezhdina: "Defending the Interests of the People"]

[Text] Pain and concern for the fate of Lithuania—one of the country's 15 fraternal republics—and for the fate of hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians, Belorussians, Russians, Jews, and Poles—all the inhabitants of Lithuania—are with us all constantly at this time. The decision of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet on withdrawal from the USSR and the revival of the 1938 bourgeois Constitution adopted in violation of the USSR Constitution has brought about a storm of indignation in our country. Yesterday we spoke by telephone with I.I. Kuolyalis, secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party (on the CPSU Platform), and asked him to describe recent events in the republic.

"The press has already reported that a plenum of our party Central Committee was held recently," Iozas Iozasovich said. "The communists discussed with a great sense of responsibility the results of the CPSU Central Committee March (1990) Plenum and the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the political situation in the republic and discussed ways of emerging from the political crisis. The communists called things by their name, and the declaration adopted by the plenum, 'The Political Situation in Lithuania,' emphasized absolutely clearly that a coup d'etat had occurred in the republic and that reactionary forces, which have essentially begun to dismantle socialism, have come to power."

[Nadezhdina] Iozas Iozasovich, do the communists adhering to the CPSU Platform have a sense of the support of nonparty and various strata of the population?

[Kuolyalis] Not only here in the USSR, I believe, but overseas as well millions of people who watched the 18 March meeting in support of the decisions of the Third Congress of People's Deputies pertaining to Lithuania were persuaded that our position is that of the broadest people's masses. And it is in vain that the republic leadership is declaring the assent and loyalty which allegedly exist here.

[Nadezhdina] What part of the Lithuanian population would like to remain within the USSR?

[Kuolyalis] I may say with all due responsibility that the vast majority of the Lithuanian population consider themselves citizens of the USSR and will accept no other. More precise data could be shown by a referendum, but the Sajudis authorities have categorically refused to conduct one, manifestly fearing that the results would prove not to their benefit.

[Nadezhdina] There has been a report in the press that the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet is intending to submit for examination the draft law "Criminal Responsibility for Anti-State Appeals." What kind of a draft is this?

[Kuolyalis] Oh, this is a document which needs to be quoted. It clearly describes the "democratism" of the Lithuanian leadership. It says literally the following: "First, calls for the forcible violation of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania or the integrity of republic territory, for the overthrow of the legitimate authorities or for the perpetration of a serious crime to this end are punishable by up to three years' deprivation of liberty. Second, such appeals made by a group of organized people or involving the use of duplicating facilities or other mass media are punishable by up to six years' deprivation of liberty. Third, actions stipulated by Articles 1 or 2 of this law staged in fulfillment of the assignments of foreign states or representatives thereof are punishable by up to 10 years' deprivation of liberty with the confiscation of property."

[Nadezhdina] And what is meant by the words "foreign states or representatives thereof?"

[Kuolyalis] The Supreme Soviet and the CPSU—this is absolutely clear. The authorities wish in this way to block the actions of all healthy forces of Lithuania who are struggling and will continue to struggle for the country's unity and so that Lithuania might be and remain a Soviet republic. We will not retreat. The first issues of the reborn newspapers—organs of the Lithuanian Communist Party (on the CPSU Platform)—TARIBU LETUVA and SOVETSKAYA LITVA will appear in a few days, and this will be a breach of the blockade of glasnost.

Moscow Activities of Pro-CPSU Officials Viewed

LD1004171190 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 9 Apr 90

[Excerpts] According to the Soviet Constitution, every republic is a sovereign socialist state, consequently, each republic has its own mission in Moscow. However, these missions have nothing in common with diplomacy or politics, for up until the well known decisions of the Lithuanian parliament, the political standpoint of all the 15 republics was controlled by the Kremlin. [passage omitted]

Recently, Egidijus Bickauskas was appointed the new representative of the Lithuanian Government in Moscow. [passage omitted]

Egidijus Bickauskas was received by Mikhail Gorbachev, together with another Lithuanian MP, after the Supreme Council of Lithuania adopted the declaration for the re-establishment of an independent Lithuanian state on 11 March. However, the two additional attempts he made to meet the Soviet president were resultless.

Lionginas Vasiliauskas, the former deputy director of the Sajudis Information Agency, has also started to work at the Lithuanian mission in Moscow. [passage omitted]

The former representative, Jarusevicius, who is well known for his conservative standpoint, declared that he would continue to work for Soviet Lithuania. Meanwhile, the Soviet Council of Ministers declared it would also look upon Egidijus Bickauskas as a representative of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, to which Egidijus Bickauskas said that he was going to represent independent Lithuania, not withstanding the point of view of Moscow.

Thus, Moscow acknowledges only the fact of changing one representative with another. Until negotiations between Lithuania and Moscow begin, it is hard to expect an official recognition of the new status of the representative. It was decided that both Jarusevicius, who had been in this post for over 20 years, and the newly-appointed Egidijus Bickauskas would continue to work together until May. Thus, transitional, dual power was established. [passage omitted]

Meanwhile, reports are coming in that the Lithuanian mission in Moscow is frequented by former officials of the Lithuanian Government and former party secretaries. Radio Vilnius asked Lionginas Vasiliauskas if these reports were not groundless.

The former secretary for ideology of the Lithuanian subdivision of the CPSU, Valerijonas Baltrunas, who had worked in the Moscow headquarters of the Supreme Communist Party as well, is now being prepared for diplomatic work, says Lionginas Vasiliauskas. Meanwhile, Vytautas Sakalauskas, the former Lithuanian prime minister, will most probably work in Moscow's Gosplan. It seems, says Lionginas Vasiliauskas, that a shadow cabinet is being set up in Moscow from its former members. This might be confirmed by the fact that Mr. Jarusevicius made a lot of effort for Egidijus Bickauskas not to be recognized at the Soviet Council of Ministers.

This information is still unconfirmed. The former party and governmental apparatchik's have received the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party and the independence of Lithuania rather placidly. It is difficult to start life anew, being used to nomenclature privileges and serving Moscow without any doubts. It seems that for these reasons alone, Moscow has become so dear to them to (reside there).

Lithuanian Workers Oppose Landsbergis Measures

LD1004134490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] The complicated developments of events in Lithuania and the unconstructive nature of the new republican government's answers to the USSR president's appeal, which do not really open up authentic ways of resolving the situation that has developed, continue to disturb the people of our country. Streams of letters and cables from collectives and individuals who do not agree with the hasty and anticonstitutional measures being adopted by the Landsbergis government continue to be received by the supreme bodies of power in the USSR and the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, and by the president of the USSR, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. Here is the cable received from the workers of the Litrybprom Production Association, Klaipeda.

We, citizens of the USSR, do not agree with the decisions of the government of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic of 11 March 1990, and want to live in a socialist republic that is part of the USSR.

Similar telegrams are being received from the country's republics, krays and oblasts.

Manipulation of Lithuanian Deserters Scored

PM1004141990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Apr 90 First Edition p 1

[Article by special correspondent Captain Third Class V. Urban under the rubric "Events in Lithuania": "Politicians and Deserters"]

[Text] Vilnius, 9 Apr—We are better in real life than when we are at rallies. A crowd can, as one, brand someone or—on the contrary—easily forgive... Admittedly, it was the former attitude that prevailed at Saturday's rally in Vilnius' Vingis Park. As always, it was the "occupiers" who were on the receiving end.

I recall that the rally was organized by "Sajudis" in support of the act of independence adopted by the republic's Supreme Soviet 11 March. Initially it was planned to hold the rally Wednesday—the day when supporters of the USSR Citizens' Committee in Lithuania were meeting. But then the date was changed, clearly for tactical reasons. More people can be assembled on nonworking days.

And indeed, people were professionally shipped in from other parts of the republic. The organizers estimated that there were almost 300,000 people in the park. Around 20 people spoke. Including V. Landsbergis, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet; and K. Prunskiene, chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers.

Emotions went overboard, even respected leaders of the republic were not immune. Here are a few phrases noted down during Landsbergis' speech:

"Metal will turn into wax and water into stone before we go back on our word." "Forces will be found to force Russia to be reborn." USSR People's Deputy Yu. Afanasyev, who had traveled from Moscow, also spoke. Supporting the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet resolution, he said that 11 March marks the beginning of the end of the Russian Empire.

There were also very scathing assessments of the military. One speaker stated that the Army will not emerge as the victor in the Lithuanians' sacred war for freedom. Even without defending the honor of the uniform, let me say that such accusations not even remotely objective. Perhaps the fact that the only opponents that day were military people was the reason for these sharp assessments. Mobile campaign vehicles [peredvizhnyye avtokluby] toured certain parts of the city to broadcast their message. Citizens went up to them and normal discussions were conducted. Naturally, people sometimes disagreed, but the discussions were normal nonetheless.

But when a helicopter dropped leaflets over the rally, Landsbergis called them litter and the crowd unanimously supported him. What did the leaflets say? They quoted extracts from the USSR president's appeal to the people of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. People shook their fists without even reading it. And people immediately started making a point of burning the leaflets.

The image of the enemy in the shape of the Army has become quite a fixture here. Needless to say, nobody is entitled to forbid anyone from criticizing others. But "Sajudis" makes use of this right in its own way. On Sunday the headquarters of that organization broadcast an unexpected ultrashortwave report to the effect that there were disguised soldiers among the people picketing the Press Center and that servicemen were being brought in there. People surged toward the Press Center. Feelings ran high the whole day. Did this mean that assault troops had reappeared? What had actually happened? That evening local TV showed a jackbooted man among the people attending the rally, as if to say "doesn't it remind you of anything, dear viewers?"

Since the Press Center was being guarded by militia subunits from the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, I turned to Militia Colonel Yu. Arshenevskiy, a spokesman for the ministry. Here is his comment on the situation:

"The previous evening, after showing their papers to publishing house workers, 42 people entered the building. It transpired that they all came from Kaunas. That is, they were a kind of parallel guard. They did not react to our demands. That is why 250 internal troops were sent that morning to clear the building."

You already know what the "Sajudis" authorities were trying to do. That is the whole story.

The wave of rallies that is now sweeping Lithuania is just one, very small, aspect of a policy. It is far harder to discern when this policy will turn its attention to the fate of specific individuals. The ill-considered "Sajudis" slogan for soldiers of Lithuanian nationality—"Leave your units"—has now resulted in many tragedies.

There have been 132 deserters recorded in the areas of Lithuania covered by the Kaunas Garrison Military Prosecutor's Office. Having reconsidered, 47 people have returned to their places of service. The other day five deserters were arrested there. The number of people arrested and voluntary returnees would probably have been higher were it not for one serious obstacle. According to reference documents, the internal affairs command and organs have been tasked with finding the deserters. But the militia in Lithuania have now to all intents and purposes declined to carry out these duties of theirs. So everything is having to be carried out by Army forces alone.

Now we will open the iron doors of two detention cells at the Kaunas Garrison and listen to the soldiers themselves.

Private I. Vilkaytis: I was doing my service with the Western Group of Forces. I was given a furlough because my mother was ill. The furlough was then extended by another five days by the Shakyay regional military commissar. Having said goodbye to my parents, I left for service 21 March. On the Kaunas-Vilnius train I met with a deserter called Robert. He said that Lithuanians no longer had to serve in the Army and advised me to go to the republic's Supreme Soviet, which had declared independence. At the station I left my suitcase in a locker and then found a taxi driver who explained everything. He took me to the Commission for Young People's Military Service. I filled in a form. I was told to go home.

Private A. Bauras: I'm from the Transbaykal Military District. I had been serving well. That was why I was granted a short furlough. I came home and, as is necessary, signed on at the Shakyay Regional Military Commissariat. I spent my furlough with my parents in Tumkay Village. When the furlough ended 20 March I went to the military commissariat and signed off. I then bought a train ticket and started walking around the town. I was in uniform. That's probably why this guy came up to me and started asking who I was and what I was doing there. He then said that Lithuanians now no longer have to serve and asked for my military card and furlough card. He took them off me and pointed to the building housing the "Sajudis" office. He also said that I should go to office 23 or 24 there the following day. That's what I did. There I was given back the passport which I had handed in when I was drafted, along with my military card, and I was also told that now I could quietly find work or go and study. [Bauras ends]

Similar statements from these soldiers were taken by Lieutenant Colonel of Justice N. Bovsunovskiy, deputy military prosecutor at the garrison. He agreed to comment on certain unclear aspects of these cases. In particular, he noted that all those under investigation say that they have now decided to go back to their units and that this is entirely natural. But, for instance, Pvt. Bauras was arrested in a different town and in civilian dress. Something else is beyond doubt—the guys have been very skillfully manipulated by someone. Why did Bauras get his passport back so quickly? After all, "Sajudis" is a not a state organization. This same passport, in the section recording the attitude to military service, carried a stamp dated 27 March to the effect that Bauras is undergoing military service [voyennoobyazannyy]. It would be interesting to know what military roster the deserter was on.

Questions, questions.... More and more of them crop up after talking with the soldiers. It is human to be sorry for these guys, they have essentially fallen victim to the ambitious policy of "Sajudis." Not for nothing did the USSR Citizens' Defense Committee in Lithuania ask the military prosecutor's office to be lenient toward them and not imprison them.

For his part, Lieutenant Colonel of Justice A. Sorochko, military prosecutor at the Kaunas Garrison, has sent a letter to each deserter asking them to be sensible and to remember their responsibilities. His appeal has been published in the local newspaper.

Lithuanian Intentions on Militia, Army

PM1004143590 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 10 Apr 90 p 3

[S. Doronin article under the rubric "On the Situation in Lithuania": "Political Games"]

[Text] Vilnius—It would be wrong to deny that the turbulent political passions that have overwhelmed thousands of people have not had the best possible effect on the work of Lithuanian law enforcement organs. Even Minister of Internal Affairs M. Misyukonis was forced to acknowledge that crime has indeed risen.

Ideally the militia should be intensifying the struggle against those who break the law or flout citizens' individual rights. But the situation that has developed in MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] organs as a result of their depoliticization and the de facto banning of activity in any party—first and foremost the Communist Party on the CPSU Platform—is confusing people and diverting them from the execution of their professional duty.

Republic Minister of Internal Affairs M. Misyukonis has played by no means the least significant role in implementing this unconstitutional rule. You would think that the minister would be guided by good intentions and try to protect the units under his jurisdiction from disruption and the fueling of passions on political grounds. But essentially he is increasingly setting personnel against each other and making them dependent on a leadership which basically endorses separatist tactics.

A conversation with Militia Lieutenant Colonel Z. Bareyka, deputy chief of the Oktyabrskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Department in Vilnius, was noteworthy in this respect. Supporting the idea of depoliticization, he avers that this step will bring only benefits and make collectives stronger....

None of the officially registered parties in Lithuania, you know, sets itself the objective of destabilizing the situation in the republic or putting citizens' lives at risk. On the contrary, they all advocate the more vigorous adoption of decisions of a democratic nature giving people greater rights and freedoms. But for some reason a ban has been imposed on the freedom to choose your political sympathies. Where's the logic? What difference does it make who is going to combat crime: a communist, a Social Democrat, or a "Green?" The main thing is that a person tasked with protecting law and order should do it professionally and responsibly, being strictly guided by the law; but the objective of so-called depoliticization is different. The idea behind it was well defined by USSR Minister of Internal Affairs V. Bakatin in his speech to the USSR MVD collegium in February: "In practice what we are talking about is repolitization...."

But this is how M. Misyukonis' orders were carried through at a party meeting of Vilnius Internal Affairs Administration units. A decision to suspend the activities of Lithuanian Communist Party organizations was adopted without a quorum. Food for thought: The meeting was chaired by former Internal Affairs Administration Party Committee Secretary S. Blazhevich and former Political Department Chief V. Dushkin. Harboring no doubts whatsoever, they blithely left the party ranks, within which they had only recently categorized themselves as leaders of perestroyka.

Nor can the following fact fail to cause anxiety. In the republic a special militia unit, well armed and well equipped, is being set up on the basis of internal affairs organs. It is almost 500 strong and is subordinate to the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Soviet chairman personally or, in his absence, to his first deputy. The minister of internal affairs can exercise leadership of this unit only on their instructions. A group from the special-purpose militia detachment is also attached to this unit. This group includes people with a good mastery of unarmed and armed combat techniques.

Vilnius so there you have it: depoliticization. But you can't feel too confident in this slogan when you familiarize yourself with message 187/252 from the Lithuanian Republic Coordinating Council to all law enforcement organs dated 5 April 1990. It gives a recommendation which is far from neutral: to obey not the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] prosecutor but Comrade A. Paukauskas, who was relieved of his duties as republic prosecutor in connection with his refusal to fulfill the USSR and Lithuanian SSR Constitutions and the USSR Law on the Prosecution Service.

So that's the kind of depoliticization we are dealing with. Judging by it, law enforcement organs in the republic will hardly find it possible to remain aloof from the political events taking place there.

In any event, there is a definite point behind the attempts to discredit the Army in the eyes of the population of Lithuania. In the strictest sense it is the only force in the republic today which remains loyal to the USSR Constitution, and, like it or not, it has to be taken into account.

This is why the image that it is an occupation Army and an instrument of violence and terror is being intensively cultivated. Intensive efforts are being made here to persuade a people who for decades have seen the exact opposite—an army that comes to Soviet people's aid at difficult moments in their lives. The slander against the Army is also assuming international overtones. Foreign correspondents are generously "fed" information about tanks and armored transporters in the streets of Vilnius, helicopters flying overhead, paratroopers forcing their way unceremoniously into buildings.... Requests to defend a small freedom-minded people against occupation forces' tyranny are sent around the world.

But attempts of a different kind are also being made—attempts to establish contacts in the military community and sow distrust in the leadership of the state and Armed Forces there. How can you describe the proposal voiced at a republic Supreme Soviet session that the Commission for the Protection of the State be tasked with drafting the text of an appeal to servicemen serving on Lithuanian territory. The targets for the authors of the appeal, it seems to me, were defined extremely unambiguously by V. Landsbergis, the head of parliament: We must take account of the fact, he said, that among the soldiers and sergeants there are a considerable number of people who have been able to participate in the struggle for democratic initiatives in Russia and other republics in the USSR.

Unfortunately Landsbergis is not alone in his hopes of relying on young servicemen. He is also joined by the leaders of various informal associations, including the not unknown "Shchit" association. Also by, for example, L. Shemayev, member of the Moscow Voters' Association Coordinating Council, who offered very tearful condolences to the Lithuanian people in a certain late-night radio broadcast transmitted with a background of the rumbling of the caterpillar tracks of landing-force combat vehicles.

No particular attempt is made to disguise the objective of using any means to discredit the Army. Above the parliament building the flag of the International Red Cross Organization has been demonstratively raised alongside the republic's national tricolor. The volunteer militia guard has also been reinforced. But who are they guarding against?

Journalist's Impressions of Lithuanian Noted

*PM1004144090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
10 Apr 90 Second Edition pp 1-2*

[Special correspondent Yuriy Shabanov report including interviews with Vladislav Shved, secretary of the provisional Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party (on the CPSU platform), and Andryus Kubilyus, secretary of Sajudis: "Seven Notes for Parliament: Subjective Observations on a Trip to Lithuania"]

[Text] Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]—Never before had I arrived in Lithuania in such a state of anxiety. These trips had always been accompanied by a feeling of approaching celebrations, an impatient anticipation of pleasing encounters. I used to be eager to wander the narrow university streets of Vilnius, once again to stand spellbound in front of the enchantingly fragile architecture of the Church of St. Anne, to admire the fabulous beauty of Trakai Castle, to find, with luck, some amber embedded with crystals on the Palanga beaches. That was how it used to be....

Even now, the unique church and castle still stand and the sea tirelessly carries amber pebbles to shore. But apparently something has changed in people's minds, something different has taken possession of their thoughts, because (apart from the tourists) they hastily pass by this beauty as if only indirectly noticing it. I, too, I must admit, had no time to stand and admire. I wanted to understand them, today's inhabitants of Lithuania, who found themselves at a stroke, on a decision of parliament, outside the Soviet Union, so to speak: What do they think about this decision and how do they intend to live in future? Before I left Moscow I heard all kinds of things: They are driving **Russians and other national minorities** out of Lithuania, so you had better keep quiet in the streets; they are printing their own litai [currency], and you cannot buy anything for rubles; they are introducing a bourgeois system and in general erecting border markers, cutting themselves off from Russia and Belorussia. Some people even prodded me: How can you go to a foreign state without a visa?

I managed without a visa. But even on the plane I sensed that I was not alone in being curious, my head full of all kinds of rumors and conjectures—conversations of all kinds about the events in Lithuania continued throughout the flight. Vivid foreign speech was also a constant feature: I was flying to Vilnius with a couple of dozen correspondents from foreign television companies, news agencies, and newspapers. In the republic's capital itself I met with many journalist colleagues of my acquaintance and bright guys from informal publications of various orientations. More of our kind were arriving every day.

After settling into a hotel without conveniences and feeling a moment's envy for the foreigners—comfortable rooms had been found for them—the photographer and I immediately set off into the city's streets to collect, so to speak, our first impressions. And we heard Russian being spoken. No one was seizing these "impudent" guys, as I have written in an earlier reportage, or escorting them over the border. Well, I thought to myself, our land has always been rich in rumor.

Nor have they abolished the ruble, though it is true that there is nothing much to buy with it—shortages are felt very keenly here, too. They are not printing litai. True, at a sitting of parliament one zealous deputy proposed setting up a printing press to issue them, as a rather original way of cornering the obstinate labor collectives at those industrial enterprises subordinate to the union which will not put themselves under republican jurisdiction. It occurred to the deputy that workers at local production units should be paid in litai, and all scarce commodities sold only for litai. Then the directors of the union plants and factories will give themselves up: Please take us, or else the workers, who are on starvation rations as regards goods, are threatening to disperse. **Fortunately** this "tempting" idea did not inspire parliament.

Nor did we hear any abuse or insults addressed to us, although it was often made clear to us that we are **"guests of a foreign power."** But the newspapers, especially those that support Sajudis, were not inhibited about what they said. "Occupiers," "immigrants," "an idle nation"—these are not the sharpest epithets used against Russians. We also heard complaints from the Russian-speaking population about telephone calls from anonymous "well-wishers" who advised them to "get out of Lithuania" fast and accompanied their advice with outright threats. Or about people refusing to serve them in stores if they did not speak in Lithuanian.

I have no desire to generalize from these instances and cast aspersions on Lithuanians, who are friendly and hospitable by nature. They, too, I am sure, are sickened by such nationalist attacks. However, I cannot keep quiet about them.

"Why do you journalists from Moscow always focus on isolated incidents?" Lithuanian colleagues and deputies reproached us. "It would be better to write that things are calm here, there are no skirmishes...."

But even if these incidents were isolated (although that is far from true), it is a question of human lives, worries, and hopes. How can that be shrugged aside? And incidentally, about skirmishes. I myself almost became involved in one. I was interviewing people after a rally outside the republic Supreme Soviet building and recording people's opinions in a notebook with a red cover. Suddenly the crowd parted and two very drunk Lithuanian guys appeared in front of me. They tried to grab my notebook, hissing through their teeth:

"A red book, he's from the KGB, no doubt...."

A possible incident was averted by the Lithuanians themselves, who pushed the guys away and said what I took to be a few soothing words to them in their own language.

It all ended peacefully, but who can guarantee that such incidents will not turn into skirmishes, hostile actions, and interethnic quarrels? The parliament and government of Lithuania should guarantee it. R. Sokolova, a pensioner from Kaunas, wrote to Vitautas Landsbergis, chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet: "...Now that you have become chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, why are you not defending Russians against persecution and attacks.... Where is the guarantee of equal rights for all nationalities? You should go on television and explain that attacks on the Russian-speaking population should stop. The Lithuanian government invited my family to come here after the terrible earthquake in Tashkent. We were given apartments and work in our specialities, we were surrounded with concern and attention, and now they are saying: Occupiers—get out! We have nowhere to go.... The Lithuanian government should protect us! We are used to living here, and will hope for a bright future together with the Lithuanian people."

Are people protected, are equal rights ensured? Here is a report to think about. On 21 March the newspaper EKHO LITVY—mouthpiece of the republic Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers—printed an account of a press conference in parliament. V. Landsbergis, commenting on the reply to USSR President M.S. Gorbachev, stressed that "in Lithuania there is no intention of violating human rights, and the observance of these rights is guaranteed to all citizens by Lithuania's laws." Just below this the newspaper publishes a government statement saying that those who disagree with the decisions of the republic's leadership "place themselves outside Lithuania's civil society and are unprotected against negative legal, economic, or social consequences." In that case, how can the esteemed chairman be believed? And will not extremist and natoinalist forces interpret this statement as a call for reprisals agaisnt dissidents?

In general it seemed to me that V. Landsbergis and his team are lacking in political prudence. You cannot base a policy on ultimatums and confrontation. After all, the decisions of the republic Supreme Soviet and government adopted since 11 March clearly indicate the lack of such prudence in Lithuania's higher echelons, which are basically sabotaging the decisions of the country's highest state organs. Take the frantic haste to form a ministerial cabinet, with Landsbergis calling for this task to be pursued day and night. The sooner a government is elected, he says, the sooner the West will recognize it and put pressure on Moscow. Indeed, it is still open to question: Is the government to be elected, or appointed? Doubts arise, for instance, because of a remark that one of the contenders for a ministerial post let slip. What it amounted to was that he, the contender, would not have mounted the platform to address the deputies if he had not received a blessing from above. Or another point. When, during the election of the minsiter of culture and education, a deputy inquired whether the contender was hampered by being too young and having virtually no experience of work in this sphere, the chairman rebuked the questioner by saying that no one else sought to call into question the competence of the future departmental leader.

I believe it is no accident that the local press has started talking about possible diktat by the president or parliament. And people at rallies and simply in conversation have also begun to ask this question more and more frequently.

But now let me come back to the subject of political prudence. Is this what we see in the appointment of a republic prosecutor in contravention of the USSR Constitution, or in the decision to place under the republic's jurisdiction the DOSAAF [Voluntary Society for Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy] enterprises and organizations located in Lithuania? By no means. Nor is there any hint of it in the demand to citizens to give no assistance to KGB organs or in the unconcealed threats if they fail to comply, in the sheltering of deserters, or in the registration of regional guard detachments.

The feeling is that Landsbergis' team has set off on a voyage with an objective in view, but without having set a carefully plotted course toward that objective, and that it is now continuing headlong without noticing that it is caught up in a whirlpool of its own making. They have cut loose all the ropes, as the saying goes, and are now at the mercy of the elements—will they be swept away, or not? Surely this is adventurism of the first water, the kind that Professor Bilkas defined very aptly: Why jump naked into the stinging nettles, when you can put your clothes on first? Incidentally, by saying this he turned members of parliament against him. And when, guided by the voice of movement, he stood up for the disgraced chairman of the Lithuanian State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, the professor was described as having "gone Red." That is, any disagreement with the opinion of Landsbergis and his team leads to a sharp rebuke, up to and including the imposition of sanctions.

From a conversation with Vladislav Shved, secretary of the provisional Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party (on the CPSU platform):

[Shabanov] The party of the communists who have decided not to break with the CPSU has virtually been declared a traitor to the nation....

[Shved] The situation here is indeed complex. Communists are being persecuted. Not for nothing is a law being drafted on liability for antistate appeals, on the basis of which our party will in fact be outlawed. Because it advocates such seditious ideas—in parliament's view—as that of a Lithuania within a renewed federation. The most interesting thing is that all the Sajudis candidates advocated this idea when they became USSR people's deputies. The paradox is: Whereas yesterday they sought votes under this banner in order to win places in the country's parliament, today anyone who raises this same banner can receive 10 years' imprisonment with confiscation of property. There is democracy and pluralism in action for you. I think the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet is pushing us toward a neo-Stalinist society and committing acts of lawlessness. For instance, as regards party buildings and the party's property....

[Shabanov] The republic leadership states that your party is occupying those buildings by force, with the help of the military....

[Shved] Nothing of the kind. We are not occupying, but defending the party's premises and property. In principle all this should be protected by the laws, the prosecution service, and the internal affairs organs. But when they do not fulfill their functions, it is necessary to seek help. Under Lithuania's laws, the property of the CPSU, like all property, cannot be alienated. Yet with one stroke of the pen Prunskene hands over the Higher Party School building, for instance, to the teacher training institute. I think in the end the CPSU would agree to hand over part of the building to the institute, but this must be done by means of dialogue, as happens in civilized countries, and not unilaterally.

[Shabanov] Why have you not explained your viewpoint and the views of communists in general on what is happening in Lithuania on television and in the press?

[Shved] We have tried to get on television, but all our attempts have proved futile. We have only just started publishing our own newspaper. And that is outside the republic. There is no place for us. I am afraid that the term "iron curtain," which the West used to use to frighten people, will soon become a reality for Lithuania. I do not understand the position of the "guardians" of the Lithuanian people's tranquillity. If our ideas are compromised to such an extent, let them come out in public. We will dig our own hole and fall into it. They will not let us. This means they are displaying their own weakness.

[Shabanov] How do you see the idea of secession?

[Shved] I have already said that the communists want to see Lithuania in a union of equals. Nonetheless I think every people has the right to self-determination, it is ridiculous even to argue on that subject. But the problem cannot be resolved by these methods. The process is in itself painful and protracted, but they want to do it by a single stroke of the ax. Furthermore, they are looking at things from a parasitic viewpoint: Let us declare independence, they say, but everything else will stay as it was. Economic ties, for instance. Some people in our parliament see them as something like a cow: The head is in the union, where the feeding trough is, and the udders are in Lithuania. Excuse me, but that cannot happen. If a state becomes autonomous in the political sense, different principles of economic and financial relations and mutual assistance come into play.... Indeed, what is independence in the modern world? It is simply the opportunity freely to choose your form of dependence. And on whom will we be dependent if we break with the Soviet Union? A private telegram from an American who warns that businessmen will not help Lithuania if a communist is elected premier causes an upheaval in the deputies' minds. They promptly reject the candidacy of an economically literate, strong politician. That is your independent parliament for you.... [Shved ends]

I also felt that the parliamentarians have rather a one-sided view of independence—the severing of political links with the USSR, and a quick glance in the direction of the West: Who will open their coffers? But is that what the Lithuanian people want? In V. Landsbergis' opinion, they must want it: Since they elected us, they must approve all our actions. But what about the rallies of 100,000 people against secession from the union? These rallies can be disregarded: They are orchestrated. It is, of course, easy to collect 100 or 200 people, but to orchestrate a rally at which 100,000 or 200,000 are present—

allow me to doubt that. If they are trying so zealously in Lithuania to erase people's memory of everything Soviet, burning bridges, and accusing the center of all the mortal sins, is that not because they want only one thing: to present people, whether they agree or not, with a fait accompli—the choice has been made? It was Lithuanians who told me with perplexity how the Soviet emblem on the republic Supreme Soviet was broken up—with crowbars, barbarically; and how they hurriedly changed street names if they were at all likely to remind people of the Soviet system. What about the cutting of Russian schools, as they plan to do now in Kaunas, and the removal of Russian-language plates from the buildings of state institutions? This also tells us something.

In Kaunas I saw a tent in front of the gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee] building. Hunger-striking mothers of large families have been taking turns to live in the tent since 26 February. What prompted them to take such desperate action?

"Housing conditions," Aldona Markyavichene, one of the hunger strikers, said. "Many large families are now crowded together in shared rooms. We appealed to the gorispolkom—they sent us all over the place, and we came away with nothing. We wrote to the deputies of the republic's new Supreme Soviet, our elected representatives—they came and took a look, and said: Sort it out with the gorispolkom."

Before I left, I asked for the slogans attached to the tent to be translated into Russian. Here are some of them: "The gentlemen on the gorispolkom live in palaces, and the families of workers live in hovels." "Waiting lines for housing are growing, and the pockets of the gorispolkom members are swelling." The gorispolkom building loomed silent and monolithic, its unseeing windows turned toward the tent. I thought: These people will surely be forgotten tomorrow, if even today the deputies fence themselves off from them behind a palisade of political debates. You can talk at length and eloquently about human happiness and social guarantees, but what use is it, if real people are going hungry in a tent on the sidewalk, while the strong of this world pretend not to see their bitterness and distress? It is so easy to blame everything on the tyrant USSR, which, having enslaved little Lithuania, reduced it to poverty and vegetation, as the local press writes; but it is not so easy to protect every real person.

But that is what people demand. Why does parliament not heed them? Why, as the workers of the "Elfa" Plant rightly said, does V. Landsbergis not visit the labor collectives of industrial enterprises with a mixed population, so as to find out the opinion of ordinary people? Obviously he and the parliamentarians do not need that. It is simpler to sit in the auditorium and speak in the name of the people, rather than among them.

It is very easy to take photographs of the hammer and sickle carved in stone together with the fascist swastika, of a smirking youth in the deliberately torn uniform of a Soviet soldier reaching for an open bottle of vodka, of a placard worn on a demonstrator's chest: "Occupiers, Mother Russia awaits you" (these photographs, with others, are on display on the first floor of the republic Supreme Soviet building), again with the thinly veiled hint: The Russians, the Soviets, have let us down. But it is very difficult to guarantee the future abundance that is proclaimed from lofty platforms. Euphoria, it must be said, is present in many heads. I heard an elderly Lithuanian woman saying joyfully: "Let us secede, and then we will be prosperous, like Sweden." But that still has to be achieved, and much must be endured first. And sober-minded people realize that. They are already worried about possible unemployment, rising prices, social stratification.

But are those who are in power worried about these things? Verbally, yes. Time will tell, of course, what their words are worth. But from the viewpoint of such assurances, are the steps toward confrontation with the center which the Lithuanian parliament is constantly taking reasonable? After all, for a long time even after Lithuania's secession its economy will be oriented toward the USSR. In that case is it not better to part peacefully, on the basis of the laws, rather than by means of pressure, forcing countermeasures to be adopted? No, it is not—God forbid—a question of a threat of economic blockade. It is simply that instantaneous secession means the instantaneous emergence of different economic relationships, as V. Shved rightly said, and it will be beyond Lithuania's means to buy what they used to acquire cheaply. Not to understand that is to deliberately mislead the people about a speedy miracle of prosperity.

But if it is a question of misleading people, someone must be doing the misleading. What political forces are in power in Lithuania now? The Lithuanian Communist Party? No, it has virtually lost the leading role. Sajudis? But it is not a party.

From a conversation with Sajudis secretary Andryus Kubilyus:

[Shabanov] Does Sajudis intend to form a political party?

[Kubilyus] We see three ways for Sajudis to develop, which we will discuss at the next congress at the end of April. One is to organize a new party, whose ideological basis will be the rebirth of an independent Lithuania. We now have three real forces—Sajudis, the autonomous Lithuanian Communist Party, and the Communist Party on the CPSU Platform.

[Shabanov] In that case Sajudis today is something in the nature of a shadow ruling party?

[Kubilyus] We have no real power.

[Shabanov] But the deputies on the Supreme Soviet and local soviets are mainly from Sajudis.

[Kubilyus] Deputies are another matter. But the concept of a "ruling party" has negative connotations here.

[Shabanov] But all countries have ruling parties.

[Kubilyus] In that sense, yes, Sajudis has its own organization and is now in a position of supreme power. The same will be true in the localities. True, in rural localities I cannot say that we have taken full power. One of Sajudis' tasks is to reach the rural inhabitant.

[Shabanov] I have heard that this campaign to "reach" people is accompanied by threats.

[Kubilyus] I know nothing about instances of intimidation. True, there is sometimes crossfire in the press. The well-known philosopher Arvidas Yuozaytis wrote an article in the newspaper UTRO LITVY entitled "A Historical Mistake." By this he meant the election of V. Landsbergis to the post of chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet. The newspaper published responses. The author was described as a traitor and insulted in various ways. But those who took his side were published, too.

[Shabanov] Is it OK to insult people?

[Kubilyus] It is OK—after all, he expressed his view, too.

[Shabanov] Do you not think that the decision on Lithuania's secession was adopted in haste?

[Kubilyus] The formation of an independent state is always a process. Economically, above all. But now we are to some degree free politically. I do not think a gradual transition would have been any better.

[Shabanov] All the same, I think it is better to begin a dialogue within the framework of the law.

[Kubilyus] We have always considered ourselves occupied, not belonging to the USSR. We have nothing to discuss.... [Kubilyus ends]

Comment, as they say, is superfluous. Yes, Sajudis is the real political force in power in Lithuania; it dictates its will to parliament. As A. Kubilyus observed, one form of the organization's activity is to monitor the work of deputies. This monitoring is tough and, as we have already seen illustrated, involves the suppression of all dissidence. Is not that the reason for the challenging tone in the discussion with Moscow? But this tone is hardly the best. V. Landsbergis the professor of music knows very well that there are seven notes on the stave, with which it is possible to create innumerable musical variations. Why does Landsbergis the politician usually use just one note—the note of the ultimatum? Either he is finding it hard to learn a new skill. Or, as Supreme Soviet chairman and member of the Sajudis council, he has a specific purpose....

'Yunost' Radio Interviews Landsbergis

LD1004155390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1315 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Excerpts] This is Mikhail Smirnov at the microphone. All the journalists are trying to meet with Vytautas Landbsergis, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania. He does not have the time to receive all of them, yet others he simply does not want to receive, for example, as they say, those from the Soviet Union. However, a correspondent from "Yunost" radio was received by him.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent] You know, it is always interesting to find out what kind of person is in power. What are you, Mr Landsbergis?

[Landsbergis] And what are you interested in; biographical data or the size of my shoes or the color of my eyes?

[Correspondent] The color of your eyes is gray-brown, and the size of your shoes is about 40-41. I would like to know what it is that you find interesting in this post as a man to which you, generally speaking, were elected by the people.

[Landsbergis] You see, I would be very happy to spend time outdoors in some quiet place, in the woods, or on the shores of a lake. This is a fantasy of mine.

[Correspondent] This perhaps explains why R. Tagore is your favorite author, or perhaps to the contrary. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent] Are you a hard man, hard and mild, or are you simply a mild man?

[Landsbergis] How can one determine such things about himself? All this is relative concepts. I read somewhere claiming that I was such a mild man, who speaks in a soft voice, wears spectacles, and in general, what could one expect from that sort of a man. This was in the papers. Now it is said in the press that the position I hold is too hard, that I should be more complient and make some concessions because the opposite part is so hard. Therefore, somebody has to be more obliging. I have always tried by means of compromise or finding some intermediate formula to gather the organization or the leadership of the organization into unity, so that it would not go to pieces. Sometimes I managed to achieve this. Therefore, you can see that I am not a man of extremes, who uses compulsion. I myself can confirm this as if I were a bystander. However, when I am asked to be pliable on a matter of principle, then I am asked to do the impossible.

[Correspondent] [passage omitted] Besides official declarations and parliamentary decisions by the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania, what else does independence mean to Lithuania as a republic? Don't you think that this could be a concentrated expression of a certain mentality of a small nation?

[Landsbergis] Independence means to be a state and not part of another state. This is in fact as simple as that. Independence is when people have their own state. Moreover, when the nation is an ancient one which has had a state for almost 800 years with some intervals of occupation, therefore, to be a state, to us—I mean Lithuania, the Lithuanian people and the traditions of statehood—is something natural. We don't have a complex about it. On the contrary, depriving us of statehood can cause the development of some negative complexes which I would not wish on any nation, small or large.

During the decades following the annexation in 1940 we of course were not a state; we were part of another, stronger state which ruled and suppressed us. However, formally, certain structures of our own state were allegedly preserved. The time had come, which was the time for perestroyka. Time when all sham slogans, formulations and proportions went to pieces. The truth began to find its way through. And what does this mean in real terms? It is evident that in real terms, things are different. Well, we had to throw out this constitution, to regard ourselves as an occupied country, a province of Russia, or fill this [as heard] with content. Furthermore, it is our right.

[Announcer] Yes, this is complicated. You spoke about occupation and I can understand soldiers of the Soviet Army when they are told by some—not all—residents that they are the invaders. [passage omitted]

[Landsbergis] People on the street do not distinguish fineries in the use of the notion. One thing is to understand it in the legal sense—we are occupied, we are a forcibly included territory. Another thing is that to some official or military serviceman of that state, who does not understand the legal situation, it seems to him that everything is normal. [passage omitted] The legal status and the presence of the army is not defined by any treaty with the Lithuanian government, it is without the approval of the Lithuanian people. It is difficult here to find another word. Find it if you can.

Furthermore, these soldiers do anything they wish. They act as if they wish to prove that they are really an occupation army.

[Correspondent] I have crossed out from this interview only ten lines—repeats, slips of tongue, and interjections that is to economize time on the air. This is everything that Mr Landsbergis managed to answer. The time for my interview has ended. And the chairman is a very busy man—I think he works around the clock. [end recording]

Landsbergis 21 Mar Speech Cites White House

90UN1409A Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 23 March 90 p 1

[Speech by Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council, at a plenary meeting of the Supreme Council session on 21 March: "The Political Situation"]

[Text] Dear Colleagues! I will not deliver a lengthy report but I would like to make a few remarks and discuss not so much events as the social and political situation. A permanent factor of the situation is pressure on the consciousness of the members of our society, citizens, and people in the obvious hope of influencing our position.

We have all read and know about the decree of the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies and have responded to it. Nonetheless, its very existence is influencing the minds of both ordinary people and high-ranking servicemen. They have perceived it as a directive and a confirmation that the USSR Constitution operates in Lithuania as before and that USSR sovereignty indeed encompasses the Republic of Lithuania seized in 1940. This could at times prompt people to irresponsible actions. And what is particularly undesirable for us—that servicemen not be encouraged into aggressive actions since this side is constantly emphasizing the problem of young men who have abandoned their place of military service. It has not as yet been resolved by an understanding between the two parties, and some conflicts of a local, individual nature, but, for all that, of political and international content, are possible every day here. In addition, we are seeing the sorry practice in the Soviet Union of servicemen issuing orders with extraordinarily complex and even severe consequences not yet having been punished and not being punished for arbitrary action and for having exceeded their authority, even in cases where there have been human casualties. Following the Tbilisi reprisals, the notorious General Rodionov was even raised in rank. General Yazov commented positively on his military and political qualities. It is therefore becoming clear that one further exhaustive statement is needed, a more resounding and cogent response, which shows in greater detail, and in a way comprehensible to all, the logical absurdity and legal groundlessness of the decrees of the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies. The letter to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, which I signed, was diplomatic, calmly set forth our position, and did not criticize the other position. This was obviously insufficient.

Calm and the stability of the situation in Lithuania are not being helped by the rumors which are still being spread—that there will be a change in Lithuania's national borders to its disadvantage. Signatures or other protests of people to the effect that they wish by a vote or in some other way to decide where some part of Lithuanian territory should be situated on the political map of East Europe are being inspired.

We have spoken here of servicemen's tours of Klaypeda District and Eastern Lithuania, and the information is still contradictory. Some of it reports that some stakes are being driven in and that lines on the ground are being marked out. Other information which is in my possession, having inquired about this of Minister M. Misyukonisk, is that there are no such signs. Nonetheless, it is obvious that some steps have been taken if the peasants are reporting specific localities.

The purpose of all this political pressure is clear, I mentioned it earlier. It is to create the impression that in

Lithuania the domestic and, as might be said now, international situation is not stable, in order in this way to impede recognition of the government of Lithuania, which is taking final shape at this time. I would therefore like to repeat my wish, expressed to our Council of Ministers, that it make a specific study of these tours of Lithuania's outlying areas allegedly to inspect some borders and just as specifically ask General Yazov about this. According to available information this was done on the initiative of local military units, at least this was the case a couple of days ago. But they are, after all, subordinate to someone or other, and the highest authorities should be aware of their responsibility.

I spoke yesterday about one further necessity and I hope that I will be able to notify you of a document which is in preparation—an issue on which there is a protest to the Belorussian Supreme Soviet. Merely the provocative speech of a deputy from Belorussia at the Third USSR Congress, making claims on Lithuanian territory in favor of Belorussia, was sufficient for this to make an inflammatory and destabilizing mark on the consciousness of the inhabitants of eastern Lithuania. Our feelings toward the Belorussian people and Belorussians' popular movements are very benevolent and let it be clear who represents whom and on what side.

We should also describe a provocation of Central Television. Our aim was expressed very clearly: We do not want some people in Lithuania to take offense at, and others, to be incited by such relays. Our Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting interrupted the relay of a recording of a "Unity" meeting from Leningrad. Despite this, yesterday the same recording was relayed on Central Television's First Channel. We had no opportunity here to discuss and adopt a decision, but I would have proposed no relay and the interruption of the Moscow Television First Channel also. Our Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting obviously did not dare do this on its own initiative. We should, possibly, draw a conclusion from this for the future and authorize the Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting to adopt such decisions right away.

These are pressing issues which require a response. On the other hand, we may affirm with satisfaction that the situation in the republic is a tranquil, working situation and that the people's mood is upbeat. I believe that we are moving very calmly toward the future we have mapped out.

I would like to make public one short, but very important text from international politics. This is a statement from the U.S. White House, which was read out yesterday by its spokesman Fitzwater. It reads: "People of Lithuania have freely expressed their intention of restoring Lithuania's independence. The United States has constantly supported the Baltic people's right to peaceful self-determination. The United States notes that the Lithuanian Government has expressed its readiness to take into consideration during negotiations all legitimate interests of the Soviet Union, economic interests included. We note also the repeated statements of the USSR that negotiations, not force, are the acceptable way in this situation. We ask the USSR Government to set forth its interests in immediate negotiations with the Lithuanian Government. We will continue to encourage constructive dialogue. This could make the atmosphere of intimidation and growing tension more difficult. In this respect the actions and statements of the USSR Government have in recent days been a cause for concern. We are keeping a close watch on the situation."

There has never previously been such a serious warning to the government of the Soviet Union. This is very great support, it is reassurance for people of Lithuania that they should not feel alone in the giant sea of world politics. And we should be grateful to the government of this country for such support.

Publishing House Takeover Criticized

PM1004120990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Apr 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS-attributed V. Kostrov report: "Regarding the Situation in Lithuania"]

[Text] Vilnius—The CPSU Central Committee's "Press House" Lithuanian publishing center is somewhat reminiscent of a rebel camp right now. Iron chains and padlocks hang across the entrance doors and fire hoses have been positioned alongside them.

What, then, has happened at Press House? According to a spokesman from a USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] military unit belonging to the Vilnius garrison, at around 0400 hours on 6 April 11 unauthorized persons, who had secretly broken into the building through a window, were discovered and detained by a USSR MVD military detail guarding the publishing house. These included G. Jurcikonis, a Vilnius city soviet deputy.

A Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] MVD duty officer was informed 15 minutes after the unauthorized persons were detained," the officer said. "He was also sent a request from the command of the unit guarding the publishing house for militiamen to be dispatched, the detained persons taken way, and their reasons for breaking into Press House, which is the property of the CPSU Central Committee, determined. This request was turned down by the duty officer. Our attempts to reach Lithuanian SSR Minister of Internal Affairs M. Misiukonis by telephone were also unsuccessful. Meanwhile all the detainees flatly refused to comply with the detail's request to vacate the premises. Nevertheless, at around 1100 hours they did leave."

On the night of 6-7 April more than 100 people assembled in Press House: They carried publishing house staff passes, although, according to available information, not all of them were staff members. They announced that they were carrying out the republic Supreme Soviet's wishes and would guard the building—which is in fact illegal, because that task is the sole preserve of internal troops. By their further actions they obstructed the military detail, which they prevented from guarding the building, and established their own access and entry procedure.

Around 0400 hours on 8 April, hooligan elements attacked the old publishing house building, which had also earlier been placed under the protection of internal troops. Given this, the unit command took the decision to reinforce the protection of the premises, including Press House. However, when the military details arrived at Press House they were unable to enter the building, because all the outside doors were wound with chains and padlocked and had fire hoses positioned against them.

At 0735 hours local time the inhabitants of Vilnius received an appeal requesting them to...save(!) Press House. Similar appeals were repeated twice more. At 0750 hours around 200 private cars, more than 1,000 citizens with anti-Soviet and antiarmy slogans, and a group of cameramen and television journalists were already in front of the building. By 1000 there were already more than 10,000 people assembled outside Press House.

At the same time representatives of the unit command went to see V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet. M. Misiukonis, Lithuanian SSR internal affairs minister, and A. Brazauskas, first secretary of the autonomous Lithuanian Communist Party, and other officials also attended the meeting. V. Landsbergis gave assurances that the people unlawfully present in Press House executing the functions of guarding the building would be removed. However, this has not been done to date.

It should be added that even now groups of Vilnius inhabitants and press photographers are permanently to be found outside the CPSU Central Committee's Press House, and even juveniles have been urged to take part in this action. Everyone is expecting another sensation.

What is the purpose of all this? It is not difficult to guess. The supporters of Lithuania's illegally proclaimed independence have completely discarded their own appeals to tackle the current problems in the republic by purely peaceful, political means. Instead of calmly analyzing the situation affecting the building, which comes under CPSU Central Committee jurisdiction, they are embarking on actions which can only be described as a seizure of someone else's property. And all this is taking place under cover of a speculative, essentially provocative policy of playing on the feelings of certain people who are inadequately informed about the true state of affairs. Clearly, activists from the republic's nationalist movement, who state in other contexts that encroachment on other people's property is a crime, are now openly trying to appropriate what does not belong to them. They have apparently only one goal: to provoke the kind of retaliatory response which could then be exploited for their own far-reaching ends.

Loyalist Lithuanian Party Chief Interviewed

90UN1161A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian No 10, 10 Mar 90 p 1

[Interview with M. Burokyavichyus, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Provisional Central Committee, by SOVETSKAYA KULTURA correspondent O.Vostryakov: "After the Split"]

[Text] Vilnius—Professor Mikolas Burokyavichyus, doctor of historical sciences, at a recent plenum of the Lithuanian Communist Party Provisional Central Committee on the CPSU Platform, was elected first secretary of the Central Committee. Our special correspondent O. Vostryakov met with M. Burokyavichyus.

[Vostryakov] As can be seen from the results of the two rounds of voting for the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, your party does not enjoy authority and influence. Of the 91 candidates nominated from the Lithuanian Communist Party Provisional Central Committee, only four persons were elected to the republic parliament. And, to all appearances, there is no chance of an increase in the number of deputies. The party is being sharply criticized by almost all the mass media and is being called a party without a future. Is this the case?

[Burokyavichyus] The point is that the majority of Lithuanian society has, not without the assistance of Sajudis and the independent Lithuanian Communist Party, come today to live the idea of Lithuania's immediate secession from the USSR. And to present an opposite assertion, for example, that only by being part of a renewed federation may Lithuania acquire real state sovereignty, means to swim against the tide.

The Lithuanian Communist Party Provisional Central Committee on the CPSU Platform does not have its own republic newspaper, and we are not allowed on television. We have been deprived of the opportunity to communicate with the people. The whole Provisional Central Committee works on a voluntary basis, without pay and in cramped premises. We were unable to fittingly take part in the election campaign and canvass on behalf of our candidates. We were assailed by virtually all parties, by the independent Lithuanian Communist Party primarily. Criticism of the country's top party and state leadership and the Soviet system has begun to intensify at this stage of the election campaign. Incidentally, the independent Lithuanian Communist Party obtained a minority of the seats in parliament, the Sajudis candidates being the winners. The elections to the Supreme Soviet were conducted under the "Vote for Personalities" slogan, and few of these "personalities" were democrats. In addition, the newspaper IZVESTIYA of 3 March, for example, carried an article by Engineer Z. Osipov from Vilnius' "Sigma" Enterprise. It says that one Lyudvikas Simutis from Kaunas has become a member of the Lithuanian Parliament. As a member of a gang, in 1953 he killed an uncle of the author of the article, as also some other police officers and communists, and robbed stores, for which he was sentenced by the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Court to the supreme punishment. But this measure was subsequently commuted to 25 years imprisonment. The Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] KGB officially confirmed these facts. During the election campaign L. Simutis openly bragged on television how in postwar Lithuania he had robbed and shot people. Inasmuch as this regrettably known "personality" was supported by Sajudis, he was victorious in Kaunas and has become a member of the present Lithuanian Parliament. How?

I and my party friends therefore openly say that the split in the communist movement in Lithuania considerably weakened the positions of the republic's communists at the elections to the parliament and local soviets.

[Vostryakov] What are the immediate tasks of the Lithuanian Communist Party Provisional Central Committee?

[Burokyavichyus] First, the most important thing is to prepare well for the 21st Lithuanian Communist Party Congress, elect delegates, restore the party structures in the rayons and cities and establish a republic newspaper of the Provisional Central Committee in Lithuanian, Russian and Polish. The Central Committee machinery will not have departments, as before, but commissions. Now about, for example, questions of the economy, ideology, organizational- party work and so forth. We will independently, without the center, decide our personnel, financial and intraparty questions. It is gratifying to declare that new people have begun to swell our numbers and that the admittance of new party members to the Lithuanian Communist Party on the CPSU Platform has begun. There are as of the present 35,000 communists in the ranks of the Lithuanian Communist Party on the CPSU Platform. This number will undoubtedly increase.

Loyal Lithuanian CP To Hold Congress

90UN1242A Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 8 Mar 90 p 1

[Resolution of Lithuanian Communist Party Provisional Central Committee (on the CPSU Platform) Third Plenum of 3 March 1990 on the convening of the 21st Lithuanian Communist Party Congress]

[Text] 1. To convene the 21st Lithuanian Communist Party Congress on 21 April 1990 in the city of Vilnius.

2. To conduct the election of delegates to the 21st Lithuanian Communist Party Congress at meetings and conferences of the primary party organizations by direct, secret ballot on a multiple-choice basis. To determine as the representation quota one delegate per 40 communists. To hold the delegate elections prior to 10 April 1990.

3. To approve the agenda of the 21st Lithuanian Communist Party Congress:

1) To discuss the political situation of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and the tasks of the Lithuanian Communist Party under current conditions. Speaker—Comrade M.M. Burokyavichyus, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee.

2) To debate proposals of the 21st Lithuanian Communist Party Congress pertaining to the draft platform of the CPSU Central Committee for the 28th Party Congress and the new CPSU Rules. Speaker—Comrade V.N. Shved, second secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee.

3) Lithuanian Communist Party Action Program. Speakers—Comrades V.Yu. Kardamavichyus and Yu.Yu. Kuolyalis, secretaries of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee.

4) Elections of executive bodies of the Lithuanian Communist Party (on the CPSU Platform).

4. To entrust all organizing work pertaining to the preparations for the 21st Lithuanian Communist Party Congress to the Lithuanian Communist Party Provisional Central Committee, which will enlist in this work representatives of the major party organizations of the cities and rural rayons. To create groups from the Lithuanian Communist Party Provisional Central Committee and scholars of Soviet Lithuania to prepare reports.
M. Burokyavichyus, secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Provisional Central Committee.

Students To Hold Rally in Vilnius 12 Apr

LD1104090590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0800 GMT 11 Apr 90

[Report attributed to Sajudis Information Agency]

[Summary] A rally in support of independent Lithuania will be held by Lithuanian students on 12 April 1990 in Vilnius at 1100 GMT.

At 0900 GMT students will start marching from their school buildings to the buildings of the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania.

Tula Political Club Supports Independence

LD1104085390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0800 GMT 11 Apr 90

[Report attributed to Sajudis Information Agency]

[Summary] Members of the political club "Political Initiative" in Tula have adopted a statement supporting

Lithuania's independence. The statement urges a halt to provocations against sovereign Lithuania. It asks the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet to recognize Lithuania's independence and asks the USSR Supreme Soviet for all problems to be resolved through negotiations with the legitimate Lithuanian government. The statement also says that the Soviet policy toward Lithuania may provoke a fratricidal war.

The statement has been sent to the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, and to the Tula Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies.

Leningrad Rally Supports Lithuanian Independence

LD1004121390 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 0000 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Summary] Yesterday [9 April] thousands of Leningrad residents held a rally in support of Lithuanian independence and to commemorate the first anniversary of the April tragedy in Tbilisi. The rally was organized by the newly elected Leningrad council deputies and nationality communities of the city.

The slogans at the rally elequently expressed the people's support for Lithuania: Hands off Lithuania; We will let Lithuania go before the term ends and without confiscation of property; Gorbachev, what do you want the Baltic states for?

Speakers at the rally urged Lithuania not to give in to provocations which, they said, were instigated by the politicians of yesterday.

It was also stressed that the possibility of the Tbilisi events recurring in other areas of tension is still great, and Lithuania is no exception.

The demand that independence should be granted to Georgia and Lithuania was adopted.

Kirgiz Front Urges Support for Lithuanians

LD1004095290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0730 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] The Kirgiz People's Democratic Front has issued an appeal to all Muslims and members of ethnic Turkic-language groups currently living in Lithuania, urging them to support Lithuanian aspirations for independence.

The appeal also said that statements made by members of the Communist apparatus of Central Asia concerning Lithuania fall short of expressing the genuine will of the nations; Lithuanians themselves should decide their own future, not those who found themselves in Lithuania from other countries.

The Kirgiz People's Democratic Front also appealed to all Muslims and members of ethnic Turkic-language groups who are currently serving in the Soviet Armed Forces not to use their arms against the people of Lithuania, who are aspiring for their independence by peaceful means.

Lithuanian Women Received at Defense Ministry

LD1004224190 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] Lithuania's women have set out to pave the way for (?the) future consultations and talks between Moscow and Vilnius.

A delegation of 12 women, including representatives of the public women's union [word indistinct], Women's Union, the Russian Cultural Center, and other organizations has been for the second day seeking contacts in Moscow on different levels. The Lithuanian MP [member of parliament], actress Nijole Ozelyte, informed Radio Vilnius from Moscow this evening that the delegation had a broad program of actions envisaged: [word indistinct] telegrams had been sent to the USSR president, to Raisa Gorbachev (?and) the Soviet Union's fund of culture, the Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov, and chairwoman of the Soviet Union's Women's Committee, Pukhova.

Today at the Defense Ministry General Staff, the Lithuanian women were received by high ranking military officials. The defense minister denied them an appointment, pleading lack of time. The women, however, were received by chief military procurator General (?Popov) who is in charge of conscription to the Soviet Army, and by other high-ranking military chiefs. The talk concerned the most painful issues, the situation in Lithuania, and the psychological offensive of the Soviet Armed Forces against the peaceful population, the spring call-up to the Army, the fate of the youths who had been captured at the psychiatric hospital, the [word indistinct] relations in the Army, and others.

Nijole Ozelyte said that the message was clear: Everything depended on the agreement between the governments of the Soviet Union and Lithuania. If the Soviet Government recognized Lithuania's independence, all soldiers would be returned home within a fixed period of time.

Tomorrow the Lithuanian women's delegation will be received for a confidential talk at the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee. It's not clear as yet who they are going to meet. It is not yet clear either whether they will be received by Raisa Gorbachev.

Nijole Ozelyte also pointled out that the two days spent in Moscow permitted to make the conclusion that the general atmosphere in Moscow was much more peaceful than in the Lithuanian township of Snieckus, inhabited mostly by non-Lithuanians, where she had had a meeting several days before.

Academic Protests Against Travel Ban

PM2703082990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Letter from USSR People's Deputy Yan Tikhonovich under the "Editorial Mailbag" rubric: "Not A Personal Insult"]

[Text] Sometimes the personal affairs of each of us—at first glance small and insignificant—take on public importance. For instance, who cares if lecturer Tikhonovich has one or two groups of students fewer? Or that he has been reprimanded for disrupting lectures? Or that he has not been allowed to travel abroad, even a short way abroad?

Even if students are against their lecturer being changed, it was not Tikhonovich's fault that the lectures did not take place, and nobody else finds it easy to obtain visas for foreign travel.

My everyday concerns can only interest others insofar as they reflect processes taking place in social life. I would cite a quotation from VECHERNIYE NOVOSTI. Talking about candidate deputy Saulyus Razm, his agent B. Shaknis complained that at almost all meetings with voters the candidate has heard rebukes about the "Unity" group at the Pedagogical Institute. The movement's leaders—Yuonene, Burokevicius, and Tikhonovich—have settled in there.

I have tried to explain these people's logic as follows: "They have misunderstood the Lithuanian people's aspirations and the historical process, and have taken a dishonest route—'worshiping Moscow, they besmirch Lithuania and sell it short to gain jobs for themselves. This is a difficult legacy. Yuonene and Burokevicius no longer work at the institute, but Tikhonovich...'"

Tikhonovich would not be working there any more either, but he has so far been saved by his status as a USSR people's deputy.

For me the Vilnius Pedagogical Institute was not just a workplace, I have devoted no less than two decades of my life to it, and those were years of mutual understanding with my colleagues and students. I became an awkward and unnecessary person at the institute after I spoke out against blatant attacks on Poles by certain "Sajudis" leaders.

Speaking at the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies, I touched, among other issues, on the question of the difficult position of Poles in Lithuania, and not only in Lithuania. My speech did not go unnoticed. I received a huge number of letters, many of them from abroad. The mail also contained surprises. I was invited to give a course of lectures at universities in Scotland and to visit Canada and the United States to meet with members of their parliaments, academics, and Polish cultural society activists.

Please do not misunderstand me: The point is that an opportunity is emerging for me to make my contribution to what is now called people's diplomacy. Any contact between Soviet people and foreign citizens, it seems to me, broadens the horizons of mutual understanding and mutual cooperation. It was all the more strange for me that the chief of the philosophy faculty, where I have the honor of working, wrote on my application: The invitation was sent for political work rather than scientific work, and therefore the faculty cannot satisfy the request....

At the faculty session one of my colleagues said what the chief had clearly been thinking when he refused permission for the trip: If we let Tikhonovich go, there is no telling what he might say....

Once again: I have not been prompted to write by resentment about not going on the trip. And not even by the fact that the philosophy faculty in the shape of its leadership suddenly acted like a regulatory department whose function was to "prohibit and prevent." Nor am I being eaten away by envy that the door to the West is open wide for some representatives of scientific and business circles.

I would only be offended if the official organizations and individuals who sent the invitation thought that the words about perestroyka raising the "iron curtain" were just words...

British, Finnish Correspondents View Lithuania

90UN1309C Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Mar 90 Second Edition p 2

[PRAVDA correspondents A. Lyutyy and Yu. Kuznetsov; London and Helsinki reports: "View of Lithuania"]

[Text] **From London**

The British Isles, which know about separatism firsthand, are keeping a close watch on events in Lithuania. This is what I was told by G. Robertson, a well-known Labor member of parliament and deputy foreign minister in the opposition "shadow" cabinet:

"In the House of Commons I represent Scotland, which was an independent state more than 300 years ago. But we in the Labor Party have opposed and continue to oppose Scotland's separation from the United Kingdom since we believe that Scotland today is an inalienable part of this country economically, socially, and culturally. Dividing up Britain is an unrealistic policy; Scotland would then, after all, find itself in a very vulnerable position. This would be in no one's interests. At the end of the 1970's, when the separatist mood in Scotland was reaching its peak, I fought specially hard against the extremes of separatism.

"This is why I would like to hope that there will be a composed dialogue between Moscow and Vilnius for the formulation of a constitutional framework which makes it possible to satisfy the interests of both parties. Although we in the Labor Party have a perfectly distinct position regarding the constitutional justification for the incorporation of Lithuania in the USSR, we do not, nonetheless, stress separation. Constitutional reform permitting maximum realization of the principle of self-determination within the framework of current realities is needed.

"I do not wish to condemn anyone, but it seems to me that in today's Lithuania the expectations of considerable numbers of the population are too great and that this is leading to haste. But what is needed is something else—imagination and farsightedness. The crisis in Lithuania and the likelihood thereof in other republics could seriously weaken Gorbachev's positions. And this is causing people concern not only in your country but outside as well. It is for this reason that calm political dialogue is now so urgent."

And here is the opinion of a British sovietologist, G. Hosking, professor of Russian history at the University of London:

"The Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact is not recognized by the international community, and for this reason Lithuania has a basis for revising its relations with the Union. A new Union treaty and negotiations on the new terms of continuation in such a Union are needed to keep the republic within the USSR, however. The treaty between the republics which was concluded in 1922 may, in my opinion, be renewed, account being taken therein of all the present wishes and interests of its subscribers."

From Helsinki:

The development of events in Lithuania is attracting great attention in the North European countries, in those adjacent to the Baltic particularly. The prevailing tone of the statements of the commentators, politicians, and public figures is one of caution and balance, if we do not count the voices on the far-right flank, of course.

"An exceptionally important process is under way in Lithuania," Per Sori, general secretary of Sweden's Foreign Ministry, declared in an interview with Stockholm's AFTONBLADET. "And I believe that the bystander should refrain from unduly hasty pronouncements and should first familiarize himself properly with the circumstances."

"When Finland proclaimed its independence in December 1917, it immediately sought Sweden's recognition, but the government of this country at that time called on Finland to first apply to Petersburg. Such a way of proceeding would also be prudent now in the case of Lithuania," Keiho Korhonen, former Finnish foreign minister, pointed out.

"We in Finland," observed Aarno Karhilo, spokesman for the foreign minister, "hope that negotiations between Moscow and Vilnius will lead to a solution satisfactory to both parties."

Washington News Conference on Lithuania

LD1004060690 Moscow TASS in English 0554 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] Washington April 10 TASS—Decisions being taken by Lithuanian leaders are unilateral and illegal from the viewpoint of both the Soviet Constitution and the provisions of international law, Yuriy Reshetov, head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Department for International Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights, told a news conference in the Soviet Embassy here on Monday.

"From the viewpoint of international law, neither the circumstances of the formation of this or that state nor its population's composition matter in resolving the question of the emergence of a new state from it," he said.

"The people's will to decide the future of their territory is expressed through a referendum. There should be no restrictions on participation in the referendum and all citizens have equal rights to vote.

"If the population declare in favour of independent development, it is essential to determine a procedure for the further process of self-determination," Reshetov said.

"In international law, there is the institution of succession, i.e., the aggregate of norms which regulate the transfer of the rights and duties of one state to another.

"Subject to regulation are issues concerning the states' rights and duties arising from the earlier concluded treaties and all main economic and financial issues, particularly those concerning state property, national debts and succession of state archives.

"In the event of a republic's secession, questions of paying compensation to citizens who will want to leave it and of monitoring the position of compatriots who would prefer to remain in it may be also raised.

"As far as the use-of-force issue is concerned, there was no use of force in Lithuania," the news conference was told. "Under international law the use of force means violent actions (primarily armed ones) by one state, entailing a violation of the rights of another state. However, as far as Lithuania is concerned, certain measures have been taken there to maintain order. The measures were prompted by violations of human rights, rights of ownership, and law and order."

Lithuanian Parliament Commission Members Listed

90UN1409D Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 23 March 90 p 3

[Decree of the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet on the Composition of Standing Commissions of the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet]

[Text] The republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet resolves:

Prior to the adoption of the new republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet Standing Orders, the following standing commissions are approved:

Commission for Restoration of the State
Algirdas Saudargas (chairman)
Kyastutis Lapinskas
Mechis Laurinkus
Rolandas Paulauskas
Gyadiminas Sherkshnis

Commission for the Legal System
Yonas Prapestis (chairman)
Egidiyus Nichkauskas
Algirdas Kumzha
Lyudvikas-Nartsizas Rasimavichyus
Valeriyonas Shadreyka
Zenonas Yuknyavichyus
Egidiyus Yarashyunas

Commission for Protection of State and Internal Affairs
Emanuelis Zingeris (chairman)
Layma-Lyutsiya Andrikene
Pyatras Vaytekunas
Rimvidas Valatka
Romas Gudaytis
Arunas Degutis
Vidmantas Zhemyalis
Valdemaras Katkus
Stasis Kashauskas
Egidiyus Klumbis
Niyole Ozhyalite-Vaytekunene
Cheslav Okinchits
Yustas-Vintsas Paletskis
Vitautas-Pyatras Plechkaytis
Antanas Rachas
Cheslovas Yurshenas
Albinas Yanushka

Education, Science, and Culture Commission
Stanislovas-Gyadiminas Ilgunas (chairman)
Aleksandras Abishalas
Stanislas Akanovich
Irena Andrukaytene
Povilas Varanuskas
Bronislovas Genzyalis
Romualda Gofertene
Gintautas-Vintsas Iyeshmantas
Virgiliyus Kachinskas
Antanas Karoblis
Vytautas Kolesnikovas
Cheslovas Kudaba
Iokubas Minkyavichyus
Vytautas Palyunas
Algirdas Patatskas
Kazimeras Saya
Mindaugas Stakvilyavichyus
Saulyus Shaltyanis
Lenginas Shepetis
Vidmante Yasukaytite

Environmental Protection Commission
Rimantas Astrauskas (chairman)
Vladimir Berezov
Birute Valenite
Eugeniyus Gentvilas
Virginiyus Pikturna
Algimantas Seyunas
Yonas Tamulis
Aurimas Taurantas
Yonas Shimenas

Economics Commission
Kazimeras Antanavichyus (chairman)
Aleksandras Ambrazyavichyus
Vilyus Baldishis
Gyadiminas Vagnoryus
Kyastutis Glavyatskas
Yuozas Karvyalis
Arvidas-Kostas Leshchinkas
Bronislovas Lubis
Stasis Malkyavichyus
Vladas Terlyatskas
Albertas Shimenas

Budget Commission
Audryus Rudis (chairman)
Eduardas Vilkas
Yonas Pangonis
Lyudvikas-Saulyus Razma
Prantsishkus Tupikas
Algirdas Endryukaytis
Leon Yankelevich

Agrarian Commission
Eymantas Grakauskas (chairman)
Povilas Aksomaytis
Lyaonas Apshega
Mikolas Arlauskas
Yonas Machis
Lyaonas Milchyus
Albertas Mishkinis
Pyatras Poshkus
Algirdas Razhauskas
Kyastutis Rimkus
Rimvidas Survila
Edvard Tomashevich
Igimantas Ulba

Commission for Health Care and Social Problems
Medard Chobot (chairman)
Vityanis Andryukaytis
Yulyus Beynortas
Miglute Gerdaytite
Pyatras Ginetas
Birute Nedzinskene
Vytautas Puplauskas
Rasa Rastauskene
Valentina Suboch
Kazimeras Uoka

Citizens' Rights and Nationality Affairs Commission
Virgiliyus Chepaythis (chairman)
Zbignev Baltsevich
Ryshard Matseykyanets
Nikolay Medvedev
Donatas Morkunas
Eugeniyus Petrovas
Lyudvikas Simutis
Yurgis Yugyalis
Vladimir Yarmolenko

Self-Management Affairs Commission
Statis Kropas (chairman)
Niyole Ambrazaytite
Yuozas Dringyalis
Kyastutis Grinyus
Alfonsas Zhalis
Stanislav Peshko
[Signed] V. LANDSBERGIS, chairman of the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet, Vilnius, 20 March 1990.

Lithuanian Law on Government Published

90UN1421A Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 30 Mar 90 pp 1, 2

[Text of Republic of Lithuania Law on Government]

[Text] **I. General Provisions**

Article 1. Government of the Republic of Lithuania—the supreme government organ of the Lithuanian state

Executive power in the republic of Lithuania is exercised by the republic of Lithuania government. The latter is the supreme organ of government of the Lithuanian state.

The republic of Lithuania government has a right to resolve all issues of state government unless they fall within the scope of responsibilities of the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet, its Presidium, and the chairman of the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet pursuant to the Constitution (Main Law) of Lithuania.

The republic of Lithuania government issues decrees and directives proceeding from, and with a view to executing, the laws of the republic of Lithuania and other decrees of the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet, and organizes and verifies their execution.

Compliance with the decrees and directives of the republic of Lithuania is mandatory on the entire territory of the republic of Lithuania.

Article 2. Main spheres of operation of the Republic of Lithuania Government

Within its authority, the republic of Lithuania government:
1) takes care of preserving and augmenting the property of the republic, and guarantees the freedom of economic operations for all property owners, a variety of ownership forms, and their equal rights;
2) implements a national security policy and manages the protection of the land;
3) resolves the economic issues of the republic proceeding from the economic principles of operation and the rules of market economy, and taking the interests of society into account;
4) implements a national scientific and technical policy and resolves the issues of state regulation of scientific-technical progress;
5) develops concepts and programs of development of the Lithuanian economy;
6) ensures the implementation of social justice and dependence of the income of the populace on the usefulness of the results of their labor for society;
7) creates conditions for improving the standard of living of the populace of the republic and meeting its cultural and spiritual needs;
8) pursues a vigorous policy for protecting the health of the populace;
9) develops goods-and-money relations and economic contacts with other states on the basis of contracts;
10) ensures rational utilization and conservation of natural resources, protection of the populace and the environment;
11) ensures the reinforcement of the rule of law, protection of public order, and protection of the rights and freedoms of citizens;
12) carries out foreign policy within its authority;
3) submits proposals regarding legislation to the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet.

Article 3. Main principles of operation of the Republic of Lithuania Government

In its operations, the republic of Lithuania government:
is guided by the Constitution (Main Law) of Lithuania and other laws of the republic of Lithuania;
proceeds from the principles of democracy, legality, and public good;
ensures glasnost in its activities;
considers issues collectively, makes decisions, and ensures personal responsibility of the members of the Republic of Lithuania Government.

Article 4. Composition of the Republic of Lithuania Government. Procedures for forming the Republic of Lithuania Government

The republic of Lithuania government is formed in the following composition: chairman (prime minister) of the republic of Lithuania government, his deputies, and ministers of the republic of Lithuania.

Only a citizen of Lithuania appointed for not more than two consecutive terms may be a member of the republic of Lithuania government.

The republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet nominates and relieves the chairman (prime minister) of the republic of Lithuania government of his responsibilities at the request of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet.

At the request of the chairman (prime minister) of the republic of Lithuania government, the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet confirms and relieves of their responsibilities the ministers of the republic of Lithuania taking into account the conclusions of the permanent commissions of the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet.

In the event the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet refuses to confirm a minister designate, the chairman (prime minister) of the republic of Lithuania government submits a new candidacy for consideration by the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet.

The republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet forms the republic of Lithuania government no later than one month after the day of the personal introduction of the composition of the republic of Lithuania government.

Article 5. Action program of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania

The newly formed republic of Lithuania government submits to the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet its program of future actions for the duration of its term in office for consideration and approval.

Article 6. Resignation of the Republic of Lithuania Government

The republic of Lithuania government submits its resignation to the newly elected republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet at its first session.

By a decision of the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet, the republic of Lithuania government performs its functions until a new republic of Lithuania government is formed.

Article 7. Responsibility and subordination of the Republic of Lithuania Government

The republic of Lithuania government is responsible to the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet and reports to it. The members of the republic of Lithuania government are accountable pursuant to the laws of the republic of Lithuania.

The republic of Lithuania government makes a report on its work to the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet at least once a year.

A minister of the republic of Lithuania makes a report on his work to the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet at the latter's request.

The republic of Lithuania government, or the minister of the republic of Lithuania to whom an enquiry from a republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet deputy has been addressed at a session of the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet concerning the work of the republic of Lithuania government or the organs reporting to him, must respond orally or in writing in keeping with the procedures set forth by the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet.

Members of the republic of Lithuania government respond to current questions from the deputies of the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet once a week for one hour during sessions of the Supreme Soviet.

The republic of Lithuania government discusses the recommendations of the commissions of the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet, as well as proposals by the deputies of the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet, regarding the operation of the republic of Lithuania government or the organs subordinated to it, and informs them before the deadline set of the results of review or what is being done with a view to improving these activities.

Article 8. The right of the Republic of Lithuania Government to resign

The republic of Lithuania government has a right to submit its resignation to the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet if it believes that it is incapable of carrying out the action program of the republic of Lithuania government.

All ministers of the republic of Lithuania government have a right to resign.

Following the resignation of the chairman (prime minister) of the republic of Lithuania government, the entire republic of Lithuania government resigns.

The republic of Lithuania government remains in office until a new republic of Lithuania government is formed.

Article 9. A vote of no confidence in the Republic of Lithuania Government

The republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet may give a vote of no confidence to the republic of Lithuania government or a republic of Lithuania minister.

A vote of no confidence may be given to the republic of Lithuania government or a republic of Lithuania minister if two-thirds of the total number of deputies participate in favor of such a decision in a secret vote.

Following a vote of no confidence in the republic of Lithuania government or a republic of Lithuania minister, the full composition of the republic of Lithuania government or the republic of Lithuania minister in question must resign. The republic of Lithuania government or the republic of Lithuania minister remain in office until a new republic of Lithuania government is formed or a new republic of Lithuania minister is nominated.

Article 10. Participation by the Republic of Lithuania Government in the work of the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet

Chairman of the republic of Lithuania government (prime minister) and members of the republic of Lithuania government are entitled to take part in the sessions of the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet, meetings of the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet commissions, and to state their views on the issues discussed.

Article 11. Social guarantees for members of the Republic of Lithuania Government

Members of the republic of Lithuania government enjoy equal social guarantees and cannot have social privileges.

In the event of a reorganization of the republic of Lithuania government, resignation of the government and its individual members, as well after the end of the term in office of the members of the government, social guarantees are extended to them which are set forth in a separate law.

Article 12. Ban on the involvement of the members of the Republic of Lithuania Government in economic activities

The involvement of the members of the republic of Lithuania government in commercial economic activities and participation in managing economic organizations is prohibited.

II. Responsibilities of the Republic of Lithuania Government

Article 13. General issues of responsibilities of the Republic of Lithuania Government

Within its authority, the republic of Lithuania government:

1) implements the domestic and foreign policy of the Lithuanian state;

2) leads the organs of protection of the land, security of the state and its citizens;

WA0904192490 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 30 Mar 90 pp 1, 2

3) implements the programs of economic and social development of the republic and creates conditions for the operation of self-governments;

4) drafts the budget of the Lithuanian state and implements the adopted state budget;

5) specifies the functions of the republic of Lithuania ministries and other organs subordinated to the republic, the avenues for their activities and the total amount of expenditures for maintaining them within the framework of the total amount of funding for maintaining the government organs established by the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet, and monitors and coordinates their activities;

6) implements the laws of the republic of Lithuania and monitors the execution of government decisions.

Article 14. Principal powers of the Republic of Lithuania Government in the sphere of social security, education, science, culture, and health care

The republic of Lithuania government:

1) carries out measures aimed at ensuring the minimum standard of living and minimum salary for the population of the republic which are commensurate with the level of economic development;

2) implements state policy in the sphere of regulating the migration of the populace, protection of the family, motherhood, and childhood;

3) ensures that jobs are available for the entire able-bodied population of the republic, guarantees the creation of safe and non- injurious conditions for labor and due conditions for recreation;

4) carries out the general policy of social security for the populace, takes measures aimed at improving health care, and developing physical education and sports;

5) ensures living conditions and the opportunity for all the residents of the republic to receive the education, professions, and qualifications they desire, taking the needs of the republic into account;

6) encourages the development of science in the republic, takes care to preserve the cultural heritage and meet the needs of the ethnic communities of Lithuania and Lithuanians residing in other countries for national culture and education;

7) takes measures with a view to providing foodstuffs, manufactured goods, services, and apartments for the populace.

Article 15. Principal powers of the Republic of Lithuania Government in the economic sphere

The republic of Lithuania government:

1) as directed by the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet, performs the functions of the owner of state assets and creates due conditions for the development of private and collective property;

2) regulates by economic and legal means the activities of all branches of the economy and property owners situated on the territory of the republic of Lithuania;

3) establishes rational proportions for the utilization of national income and economic development, and develops, coordinates, and carries out the republic's programs of economic and social development;

4) develops a draft budget of the Lithuanian state, sets forth pricing procedures, and implements a general policy for labor remuneration;

5) within its authority, makes decisions on implementing the policy of the state in the sphere of monetary circulation and credit;

6) organizes and regulates the international economic operations of the republic of Lithuania;

7) within its authority, issues licenses and permits for economic operations, and establishes quotas and customs dues;

8) coordinates economic cooperation with the Baltic and other states;

9) manages the state stock of natural resources and establishes quotas and norms for utilizing nature.

Article 16. Principal powers of the Republic of Lithuania Government in the sphere of law enforcement

The republic of Lithuania government:
1) implements measures aimed at protecting the rights and freedoms of citizens, protecting the interests of the state, and maintaining public order;
2) monitors compliance with the law by the ministries of the Republic of Lithuania and other organs subordinated to it, and sets forth the main directions of legal work in the economy of Lithuania;
3) sees to the improvement of legal regulations in the economic and social sphere.

Article 17. Principal powers of the Republic of Lithuania Government in the sphere of ensuring the protection of the land

The republic of Lithuania government:
Within its authority, the republic of Lithuania government carries out measures for protecting the land, organizes services for the protection of the land, and monitors their operations.

Article 18. Principal powers of the Republic of Lithuania Government in the sphere of foreign policy

The republic of Lithuania government:
1) signs treaties with foreign states and international organizations and takes measures to ensure their execution;
2) develops relations between the republic of Lithuania and foreign states and international organizations;
3) submits to the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet proposals for setting up republic of Lithuania missions in foreign states and creating the missions of other states in the republic;
4) represents the republic of Lithuania in international relations in keeping with its authority.

WA0904192590 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 30 Mar 90 pp 1, 2

III. Relations Between the Republic of Lithuania Government and Other State Organs

Article 19. Relations between the Republic of Lithuania Government and the government organs of local self-government

Within its authority, the republic of Lithuania government:
1) monitors the execution of the laws of the republic of Lithuania and of government decisions by local self-government bodies;
2) may suspend and protest the decisions of self-government organs of the highest level in the Council of Self-Government if they contradict the republic of Lithuania Constitution (Main Law) or other laws of the republic; if issues of contention develop the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet makes the final decision on them;
3) together with the government organs of local self-government organizes the management of the facilities of all-state significance (production infrastructure);
4) envisages general directions for the development of social security, health care, education, culture, and environmental protection.

Article 20. Management of the Republic of Lithuania ministries and other organs subordinated to the Republic of Lithuania Government

The republic of Lithuania government:
1) manages the work of ministries of the republic of Lithuania and commissions of the republic of Lithuania government, guides and monitors the operation of state services and inspectorates of the republic of Lithuania;
2) submits proposals for setting up, reorganizing, or liquidating the ministries of the republic of Lithuania to the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet;
3) if necessary, creates the state services and inspectorates of the republic of Lithuania, government commissions of the republic of Lithuania, as well as conducts the reorganization and liquidation of these organs;
4) adopts regulations on the Republic of Lithuania ministries, state services, inspectorates, and government commissions of the republic of Lithuania.

Article 21. Ministries of the Republic of Lithuania

The ministries of the republic of Lithuania represent central organs of executive power. The ministries of the republic of Lithuania are headed by the republic of Lithuania ministers who are personally responsible for the accomplishment of tasks with which respective ministries are entrusted.

Within their authority, the ministries of the republic of Lithuania implement government policies on the basis of the laws of the republic of Lithuania, decrees and directives of the republic of Lithuania government, and head the spheres of management entrusted to them, as well as monitor their execution.

The republic of Lithuania ministries predict developments in the sphere of their operations, study its world standard and trends, develop programs for scientific-technical and socioeconomic progress, and ensure the social protection of their employees and cadre training.

Within their authority, the ministries of the republic of Lithuania pass laws and other acts.

Article 22. State services and inspectorates of the Republic of Lithuania

The republic of Lithuania government sets up the state services and inspectorates of the republic of Lithuania to resolve the issues of state management, organization of various economic sectors, and other issues not assigned to the ministries as their functions.

Within their authority, the republic of Lithuania state services and inspectorates monitor compliance with the laws of the republic of Lithuania and decisions of the republic of Lithuania government.

Article 23. Government commissions of the Republic of Lithuania

If necessary, the republic of Lithuania government may set up permanent and temporary commissions consisting of republic of Lithuania ministers, scientists, and specialists.

The work of a commission is headed by the chairman of the government (prime minister) of the republic of Lithuania, his deputy, a minister appointed by the republic of Lithuania, or in certain cases, another person.

Article 24. Oversight of the organs subordinated to the Republic of Lithuania Government by the government

The republic of Lithuania government oversees the operation of the republic of Lithuania ministries and of other organs subordinated to it.

The republic of Lithuania government has a right to cancel the acts of the republic of Lithuania ministries and of other organs subordinated to it if they run counter to the laws of the republic of Lithuania and decrees and directives of the republic of Lithuania government.

The republic of Lithuania government may discipline the republic of Lithuania ministers.

IV. List of the Ministries of the Republic of Lithuania

Article 25. Ministries of the Republic of Lithuania

There are the following ministries in the republic:
Ministry of Economics;
Ministry of Energy;
Ministry of Finance;
Ministry of State Protection;
Ministry of Culture and Education;
Ministry of Material Resources;
Ministry of Forestry;
Ministry of Industry;
Ministry of Trade;
Ministry of Communications;
Ministry of Construction and Urban Development;
Ministry of Railways;
Ministry of Social Protection;
Ministry of Health;
Ministry of Justice;
Ministry of Foreign Affairs;
Ministry of Internal Affairs;
Ministry of Agriculture.

V. Organization of Work of the Republic of Lithuania Government

Article 26. Meetings of the Republic of Lithuania Government

The meetings of the republic of Lithuania government are held as necessary.

A meeting of the republic of Lithuania government is considered legally valid if no fewer than one-half of the members of the government take part in it.

Decisions are made at the meetings of the republic of Lithuania government by a majority vote of the members of the government. If the number of votes is equal, the chairman (prime minister) of the republic of Lithuania government casts the deciding vote.

Article 27. Issues resolved at the meetings of the Republic of Lithuania Government

The issues of implementing state policies are resolved, and programs of economic and social development of the republic, draft budgets of the Lithuanian state and their implementation, as well as those of the laws of the republic of Lithuania and decrees of the republic of Lithuania government, are reviewed at the meetings of the republic of Lithuania government.

Article 28. Chairman (prime minister) of the Republic of Lithuania Government

The chairman (prime minister) of the republic of Lithuania government heads the republic of Lithuania government and coordinates its activities.

The chairman (prime minister) of the republic of Lithuania government represents the republic of Lithuania government.

The chairman (prime minister) of the republic of Lithuania government:

1) decides the personal composition of the republic of Lithuania government and submits corresponding proposals to the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet by the appropriate deadlines;

2) submits proposals for reorganizing the republic of Lithuania government to the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet;

3) holds and chairs the meetings of the republic of Lithuania government;

4) nominates and dismisses deputy ministers of the republic of Lithuania, heads of the state services and inspectorates of the republic of Lithuania, and their deputies;

5) in emergencies, makes decisions on the issues of governing the state within the authority of the republic of Lithuania government, and informs the government of them at the next meeting;

6) disciplines deputy ministers of the republic of Lithuania, heads of state services and inspectorates, as well as their deputies.

In the event of differences with members of the republic of Lithuania government on important issues concerning the operation of the republic of Lithuania government, the chairman (prime minister) of the republic of Lithuania government has a right to raise in the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet the issue of replacing individual members of the republic of Lithuania government or the resignation of the government in its entirety and the formation of a new Lithuanian Republic government.

In the absence of the chairman (prime minister) of the republic of Lithuania government, the duties of the chairman of the republic of Lithuania government are performed by one of his deputies.

Article 29. Decrees and directives of the Republic of Lithuania Government

Norm-setting decisions of the republic of Lithuania government or decisions of immediate interest for the economy are issued in the form of decrees. republic of Lithuania government decrees are published in the "Bulletin of the republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet and Government," and if necessary in the mass media.

Decisions on urgent and current issues are issued in the form of republic of Lithuania government directives.

Republic of Lithuania government decrees are signed by the chairman (prime minister) of the republic of Lithuania government and by the administrator of government affairs.

Republic of Lithuania government directives are signed by the chairman (prime minister) of the republic of Lithuania government or his deputies.

Article 30. Apparatus of the Republic of Lithuania Government

The administration of government affairs constitutes the apparatus of the republic of Lithuania government.

The functions of the administration of affairs are set forth in regulations adopted by the republic of Lithuania government.

The structure of the administration of affairs is confirmed by the chairman (prime minister) of the republic of Lithuania government.

The positions of government counselors and experts are introduced by the staff of the administration of affairs with a view to advising the chairman (prime minister) of the republic of Lithuania government on significant issues of state government.

Government advisers are appointed and dismissed by the chairman (prime minister) of the republic of Lithuania government.

No party organizations or social movements may be created or operate in the apparatus of the republic of Lithuania government.

[Signed] Chairman of the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Soviet V. Landsbergis, Vilnius, 22 March 1990

Baltic Council Session Set for 14 Apr in Estonia

LD1004140190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1030 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Summary] A regular sesison of the Baltic Council will take place on 14 April of the current year in the city of Parnu in Estonia.

Issues related to the current political situation and the upcoming Baltic Assembly will be discussed at the session.

According to preliminary information, members of the Sajudis Seimas Council Vytautas Landsbergis, Virgilijus Cepaitis, Bronius Kuzmickas, Mecys Laurinkus, and Romualdas Ozolas will take part in the session of the Baltic Council.

Supreme Soviet Continues Debate on Independence

PM1104115190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Apr 90 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Sessions Held"]

[Text] Tallinn, 10 Apr—"Decisions one knows cannot be implemented, should not be adopted"—Estonian Supreme Soviet Speaker J. Nugis expressed this idea in relation to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, but one would very much like the Estonian supreme organ of state power to follow this principle in its own day-to-day activities.

The parliamentary routine does not inspire much hope at the moment.

The discussion of the draft "Provisional System of Rule on the Territory of Estonia in the Transitional Period" is into its second day. Both the provisional system and the transitional period arose after the 30 March adoption of the resolution "On Estonian Statehood," which the existing authorities consider unconstitutional, while the state system itself is to be replaced by the one that existed prior to 1940. Occupation. Occupying forces. Occupation structures of power. These words are commonplace on the lips of Supreme Soviet members.

Overplaying the occupation thesis is the best possible way to help those who are against young Estonians' service in the USSR Armed Forces.

Now that the spring draft has started, the Supreme Soviet is considering a draft law "On the General Military Service Obligation" which proposes substantially limiting on the republic's territory the action of the Union Law on the General Military Service Obligation and abolishing criminal prosecution for evading the draft and military service. If it is adopted it will "nicely" complement the existing law on alternative service that was adopted by the last Supreme Soviet. According to this law, young men who cannot carry weapons for ethical or other valid reasons can serve at local national economic facilities.

Estonian Supreme Soviet Discusses State Status

LD1004233590 Moscow TASS in English 2258 GMT 10 Apr 90

[By TASS Correspondent Albert Maloverian]

[Text] Tallinn April 10 TASS—Decisions that cannot be implemented should not be made. This maxim was recalled by Jula Nugis, the Estonian Supreme Soviet's speaker, with reference to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet.

"I would not like the Estonian supreme body of state authority to forget this in its own day-to-day practice, but the parliamentary routine has inspired little hope so far."

The draft of the "Provisional Order of Government" was discussed for the second consequent day on Tuesday.

Both the provisional order and the transitional period emerged after the resolution "On the State Status of Estonia" was adopted on March 30. It described the existing power structure as unconstitutional and opted for substituting the present state structure for the one which existed before 1940. The words "occupation" and "occupation troops" became current in speeches by Estonian parliamentarians.

When Soviet People's Deputy Academician Endel Lippmaa co-reported on the provisional order, a delegate asked him to name attributes of occupation. The academician failed to give a clear-cut definition or list attributes.

If power is in the hands of invaders in Estonia, why are there only four military people in the Supreme Soviet? How could the Supreme Soviet, which is a tool in the hands of occupation authorities, permit the adoption of such a document as "The State Status of Estonia" and the consideration of the draft "Provisional Order of Government" drawn up in pursuance of the former and presented as a kind of fundamental law of the transitional period? All these questions require answers, but answers are not available so far.

Now that the time has come for the regular call-up, a bill is being considered by the Estonian Supreme Soviet "On the Universal Military Duty". The bill is intended to substantially curtail the effect of the federal law on this score on Estonian territory and annul criminal liability for evasion from the draft and military service. If promulgated, this law will effectively complement the earlier enacted law on the alternative service. According to that law, young men, who are unable to do their national duty in the Armed Forces for ethical or other valid reasons, are allowed to do their spell at economic installations in the neighborhood. With the anti-occupation campaign what it is, most young men of the call-up age will seek alternative service. A conflict is in the making which it will be hard to overcome.

The theat of the conflict would not have been so imminent if the Estonian Supreme Soviet had acted in keeping with the maxim recalled by its chair, Jula Nugis.

Estonia's Lauristin Interviewed on Independence

90UN1231A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 8 Mar 90 p 2

[Interview with Maryu Lauristin in Moscow at the 8 March session of the USSR Supreme Soviet by A. Birov, press attache at the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic representation in Moscow: "On the Approaches to the Talks About the Future of Estonia"]

[Text] [Birov] Tell us your opinion on how the talks between Moscow and the three Baltic republics on the restoration of their independence will develop.

[Lauristin] I am sure that we will find a way to talk constructively about this, as has happened with other problems. The main thing now is to avoid the fear and uncertainty that everything could be changed by a unilateral violent intervention. There must be an opportunity precisely for the path of calm negotiations to resolve all controversial issues and acute questions. It is impossible to find a path to independence and peace by ignoring partners, the international community, and the law, and we ourselves are seriously prepared for this. We have proposals in all aspects and on all issues—on the economy, on strategic issues of policy, and on problems relating to social guarantees for the non-Estonian population. I hope that all inhabitants of the republic, despite differences and even extreme opinions, will realize that we need civic peace, we need stability, we need consideration of mutual interests, and we need to solve all of Estonia's problems in this spirit.

It is from this standpoint that we must evaluate the appeal issued by the Citizens' Committee to the Russian-speaking population, namely, as a first open search for contact from this movement. I think that no one will solve anything in Estonia using methods of force. If there are such forces then we must find out what their motives are in acting this way.

[Birov] Does this mean that you believe that the reality of Estonia's secession from the Union cannot result in the appearance of tanks in the streets?

[Lauristin] Well, you see, we were annexed with the help of tanks in the streets, and now, when the entire public has recognized this as a fact, we need not repeat the mistakes of the past but must look for a normal political settlement. And looking at events in East Europe, I am nevertheless inclined to believe that a similar model is possible for resolving the Baltic question.

[Birov] You have mentioned social guarantees for the non- Estonian population in the event that Estonian independence is achieved. It is probably precisely this issue that is today causing the most concern and various misgivings and that is preventing the Russian-speaking population from looking to the future with confidence and from supporting the Estonians in their desire for Estonian independence. What social guarantees for non-Estonians are you personally prepared to defend?

[Lauristin] First, for all who make their choice for a free and independent future for Estonia there should be the guarantee of citizenship in the Estonian Republic with all rights stemming from this. There will be no "second-class citizens" in the Estonian Republic, everyone will have equal rights and opportunities. And if a person through his own free choice does not wish to accept Estonian citizenship then I believe that offering **bilateral guarantees (from both Estonia and the USSR) of protection for the rights and social interests of USSR citizens living in Estonia**should be a separate subject of talks on the restoration of independence. Second, the national minorities in the Estonian Republic will be constitutionally guaranteed all opportunities to develop their own culture and education, and also free dealing with their "homeland." Of course, the details of all these issues are a task for the Supreme Soviet that is elected, and they will be the subject of various discussions and negotiations.

[Birov] What can we expect from the upcoming extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies?

[Lauristin] We expect first and foremost the start of debate on the problem of the national-political arrangement of the Union because our future must also be determined in this context. The more democratic the political arrangement in the Union the greater the recognition of the need for the sovereignty of all peoples and the more normal the attitude toward our demands will be.

But for the USSR Supreme Soviet the main thing is the question of using the regular army against the people. There are many examples of this: It started in Tbilisi, and now it is Azerbaijan. These examples of the use of the Army in combat situations and armed against the populations of the republics are what is at variance with international conventions and the UN Charter and so forth. It should become first and foremost the object of principled discussion at the Congress of the Soviets.

[Birov] What do you think about the institution of President of the USSR? This time, evidently, the president will be chosen by the congress. But what about the future?

[Lauristin] In principle it is essential that the president not be elected by the congress. It could be incorporated in the Constitution that the people elect the president. But exactly how remains in dispute because there are direct elections and elections through intermediaries. Direct elections mean that the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic will elect the president because a majority of the country's population lives there. The other view assumes an election collegium from all the republics with equal numbers of representatives in order to prevent any advantage for particular republics. But I think that this issue will be discussed and worked on.

[Birov] The journal NEWSWEEK has named you Woman of the Year for 1989. Only the most interesting political figures have achieved and been worthy of this. And according to polls conducted by sociologists and journalists in Estonia, you have in recent years also been at the top of the "popularity table." It is quite logical for such a popular person to run for the post of president of a sovereign Estonia. Do you have any definite goals in this respect?

[Lauristin] The People's Front has expressed an idea according to which nomination for the Supreme Soviet simultaneously signifies a desire for that person to be a candidate for the post of president. And they nominated precisely me, which, of course, caused certain idle talk and ferment in republic public opinion. I should say that this was not the subject of any talks with me beforehand and was quite unexpected for me.

Now I regard it as a factor in the election struggle, where any political force or faction has its own leaders. But I do not now see in Estonia any sharp competition for the post of president, and even less do I know who will represent the Supreme Soviet and ultimately resolve this problem also. As far as my personal readiness to become president is concerned, after IZVESTIYA announced this and printed it I naturally had to think about it: Is this possible in principle (even though personally I do not regard it with any happiness)? I would consider it possible to be involved in the presidential elections in only one circumstance, namely, when I felt that I personally could mitigate some of the contradictions in our country and promote dialogue between the various political and social forces, and also the national communities here in the republic. And I am sometimes afraid and alarmed by the fact that men are sometimes very cruel—this is also a motive for me in this proposition, and I am beginning to think this way: Perhaps in fact it will be necessary to soften some of the sharp angles of contact, and sometimes even confrontation and contradiction. But at the same time I believe that Arnold Ryuytel could handle this role very well. He is a very gentle man and he understands the situation today. So I am not under any illusions and I am not burning with ambition. I am looking at this calmly. If it becomes necessary from the standpoint of the general good.... But in my soul I very much hope that this proposal will remain merely an element of the election struggle and nothing more.

[Birov] There is much talk about the upcoming congress in Estonia. It is common knowledge that the board of the People's Front of Estonia was previously critical of the idea of convening the congress. Now it seems as if many other people's deputies and also many activists in the People's Front of Estonia are ready to participate in it. How do you explain this?

[Lauristin] Life has shown the common desire of Estonians to restore the republic's sovereignty on the basis of the 1920 peace treaty between Estonia and Soviet Russia. But there are many conflicting views about how to restore sovereignty and what the political, economic, and social structures will be in a future independent Estonia. The Congress of Citizens (otherwise referred to as the congress) should be the place where these issues will be debated from various positions so that the decisions reached will be democratic and realistic. It is particularly important for me to defend two things at the congress: the first is the need for constructive cooperation between the elected organs of the congress and the Supreme Soviet elected on 18 March. And the second is to achieve at this congress agreement on providing guarantees for the democratic rights of the non-Estonian population whatever the political and economic changes in Estonia. I categorically believe that after this congress there will be nothing for the Supreme Soviet to do. It is precisely during this complicated transition period that we will all need good will and mutual agreement, not mutually exclusive positions of confrontation.

[Birov] Your tempo of life is truly a dizzy one: today in Moscow, yesterday in Sweden, tomorrow in Tallinn. I suppose that you have no place left at all for your domestic life in your home of Tartu....

[Lauristin] Today the pace of life is very fast, at the limit. And particularly for the deputies: They have to be in Moscow for the sessions and congresses, but there are also things waiting at home. And in Estonia political events develop very quickly. And we have to make trips abroad, not for amusement and leisure but for work: Political and economic contacts are being developed, and a great deal must be explained to our partners in other countries since interest in us is very high. And it is very important to see for oneself how our processes are being perceived in the West—not from the newspapers but right there; this helps in devising a more realistic policy and gaining a confident look into the future. People who are engaged in politics now simply cannot have a normal life. But I hope that this will be possible again sometime. The more so since I would prefer to continue with my academic life.

[Birov] In this connection I am reminded of the story of the revolutionaries in Russian who also sometimes gave up their personal life for their high ideals....

[Lauristin] Yes, but for them abandoning family and personal life for the revolutionary ideal was a matter of principle. They themselves wanted that. But for us it is simply a necessity. Many deputies just dream of the time when they will end their state life. We must be careful in making such comparisons, the more so since we have already gained a taste for revolutionary ideals, including the ideals of a woman who wants nothing to do with domestic life. Society has already been through that "model" and it cannot serve as an ideal or goal.

[Birov] Thank you for the interview.

Walkout Makes Latvian CP Split 'Inevitable'

PM1004152790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Apr 90 First Edition p 1

[Own correspondent Lieutenant Colonel M. Ziyeminsh report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Latvia: Congress Continues"]

[Text] Riga—The 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress has concluded until after the 28th CPSU Congress. The congress delegates' powers have been extended for this period, and the newly elected Latvian Communist Party Central Committee has been instructed to draw up program documents—not least on getting the republic out of its crisis—based on the CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th Party Congress.

What will the Latvian Communist Party's place in the republic's sociopolitical life be in the immediate future? Will it be able to secure a vanguard role in society's life and in the difficult and contradictory perestroyka processes emerging in the dynamics of the current stage of development? These questions were raised directly or indirectly by almost all speakers at the congress without exception. The congress was routine in terms of its number and timetable, and extraordinary in terms of its content.

Out of the 184 deputies in the republic's new Supreme Soviet, 111 are communists. Despite the fact that the elections are not yet over, this amounts to a majority in the new parliament. Out of the 120 deputies in the Riga City Soviet, 80 percent are communists. And yet it was repeatedly stated with alarm from the congress rostrum that "it is no longer any secret that we are becoming an opposition party in parliament."

Isn't this a paradox: Despite the mathematical majority of communist deputies, they are the opposition? Unfortunately, there are substantial grounds for such a statement. As was stated in the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee report to the 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress, the republic's communists are so polarized that in a number of cases they cannot implement a unified policy in local soviets. A vivid example of that is the recent crisis at the Riga City Soviet where, with the formation of a balance of forces among factions of deputies, the communist deputies comprising two-thirds of the total were still unable to act as a force uniting and cementing the corps of deputies.

The dividing line is whether Latvia will be an independent state or whether it will have to develop within a renewed Federation of sovereign republics. Options for the status of the Latvian Communist Party—"independent" or "renewed" within the CPSU—are also being formulated on this basis. The search for compromise solutions between the supporters of these two ideological platforms has still not led to success. And it is hardly likely to. That was confirmed by the course of the congress itself. At a decisive moment 270 delegates walked out of the auditorium. These were supporters of an independent Latvian Communist Party, with which more than 30,000 communists—mainly from rural areas—have registered. In a few days' time—on 14 April—they intend to hold their own congress. And it seems that a split in the party is inevitable. It is also annoying that the outward signs of this split are linked with the Communist Party's division along national lines.

The congress also assessed the activity of the former Communist Party Central Committee in accordance with this. Agreeing in the main with the conclusions and assessments of the political report, the congress noted that the Central Committee was unable to work out a concept for perestroyka in the republic in time or to lead the renewal process in the party. By a majority vote (476) the work of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee was deemed unsatisfactory.

A new Latvian Communist Party Central Committee and Auditing Commission were elected at the congress. A.P. Rubiks was elected first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee.

PRAVDA Assesses Latvian CP Congress

PM1004103590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Apr 90 Second Edition p 2

[Article by special correspondents O. Meshkov and I. Podsvirov: "Split or Differences? Notes from the 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress"]

[Text] Riga—Many people had not expected this turn of events. On the second day of the 25th congress, when discussion began on the Latvian Communist Party's [CP] program and statutes, A. Chepanis, deputy chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers, categorically stated from the rostrum: "We no longer consider our presence at the congress possible." More than 200 delegates—mainly from rural rayons where a Latvian population prevails—left the auditorium. "What will we do?" J. Vagris, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, asked. "Work!" people in the auditorium replied. And the congress continued, although the delegates had noticeably thinned out.

But let's return to the start of the congress. Probably nobody was surprised by the people with placards standing at the entrance to the Political Enlightenment Center before the 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress started. The diverse demands and appeals are also explicable: The situation in the republic is complex and contradictory, the population has long been polarized in line with the different views of the processes taking place.

The political report delivered at the congress by J. Vagris, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, displayed a desire to approach the analysis of the work done in the period between the two congresses and, above all, the elaboration of a concept of action for the future in a dialectic way. The participants in a Central Committee plenum before the congress criticized the draft report, noting the vagueness of the formulas and assessments it contained. It was said then that, given the current polarization of opinions, it would be hard to find a compromise to suit everyone.

A graphic illustration of this is provided by the part of the report covering the most important problem—the status of a Latvian republic. The main speaker talked about the existence of diametrically opposed views. The first is that Latvia should remain formally sovereign but actually a component of a unitary power. The second is that the rapid and successful resolution of all problems in Latvia will merely ensure its immediate constitutional reinforcement as a wholly independent state and the breaking of all state legal ties with the USSR. This is the position which it is being suggested that the Communist Party adopt: "...We Latvian Communists advocate a sovereign Latvia within a union of independent socialist states based on treaty relations." How did delegates react to this proposal?

From the congress auditorium:

Ya. Geyba, first secretary of Daugavpilsskiy party raykom [rayon committee]: We cannot be naive and erase 50 years of history. Nor can we fail to take account of the interests of all peoples living in the republic. Only a renewed Communist Party can find the correct solution along the path of autonomy. That is why we should not make any claims about not being faithful to our ideals, but look for a compromise.

E. Svars, first secretary of Aluksnenskiy party raykom: We are sometimes accused of restoring capitalism and of harboring separatist tendencies. But we intend to base our economy on mutually advantageous terms with other republics. In this regard, we are asking what our party, which we want to restructure, should be like, and what it should reflect. The answer is clear: It is intended to serve the people. The native population should see it as its herald.

I. Garayev, first secretary of Leninskiy party raykom: Where will the republic go, what will the Communist Party be like? I think that democracy cannot exist without a left wing. We have gathered not to glue together the fragments of a broken mirror, but to chart a way out of the crisis. It is only in a union and in its unity that we can find a way out of the deadlock. [Garayev ends]

Thinking about the party's activity under the new conditions—virtually under the conditions of a multiparty system—the main speaker came to the following conclusion: "...We must vigorously start and continue a dialogue with sociopolitical organizations and parties in the republic. Of course, such activity is only possible provided that the crisis in the party itself is overcome, creating an essentially new and democratic party of left-wing forces, a party with a socialist thrust."

You will agree that there is a certain lack of clarity and reticence here. After all, it is a question of a new party, not a renewed party. A party with new principles. What kind of principles? This is by no means an idle question, and the proposed bland formula by no means pleased all the delegates.

From the congress auditorium:

Yu. Lyalin, first secretary of Leningradskiy party raykom: The main thing that currently divides our Communists is the differing understanding of the ways of renewing the party, the country, and the republic. The proposed program on the Communist Party's status diplomatically states: It is not clear what kind of party we will have: a renewed party or a new party. Perhaps this is why the Central Committee has neither been nor become the headquarters for coordinating the actions of primary party organizations.

There are two clearly opposed and highly numerous sociopolitical organizations in the republic: the People's Front and the International Front of Working People of Latvia. In reality both organizations have their advantages and disadvantages. It is also well known that the current program of the Latvian People's Front has set its sights on nonrecognition of the existing system and on the creation of an independent Latvian state outside of state and political links with the USSR. How is this assessed in the report? Very calmly: This course "...provoked a sharp reaction and gave rise to a certain (!) sense of alarm among the rest of society." Here is the assessment of the opposed organization: "As in other parts of the Soviet Union, the International Front of Working People of the Latvian SSR and the formations with political links to it—such as the United Labor Collectives Council and several associations of war veterans and reservists—belong to left-wing conservative organizations in our republic." What serious hope can there be for dialogue after such a pejorative assessment?

Many of the speeches by delegates at the congress drew an analogy with the situation in Lithuania and voiced alarm for the fate of the Latvian Communist Party. Will it be able to overcome its "inner sickness"—an incipient split. And will anything good come of the stubborn desire of the supporters of an independent party who, thinking about the status of the republic's party organization, invariably stress that there should be an independent party in an independent state. Isn't this a road to nowhere?

Although the ideological differences between the members of the republic's party organization are already an obvious fact and, in general, the outlines of a future independent Latvian Communist Party are visible, we must seek ways of consolidating forces and thinking about how to win back the party's prestige.

Unfortunately, the speakers noted, the republic's Communist Party finds itself in a severe crisis: It does not yet have a firm line or worthy leaders. As a result, even Communists often cast their votes at the elections at the prompting of the People's Front or the International Front and taking account of the ethnic background of the candidate deputies.

The depoliticization and loss of authority on the part of the party masses in primary organizations have led to a considerable reduction in the number of Communists in the republic. In just over a year around 7,000 people, including more than 4,000 who handed in their party cards voluntarily, have been expelled from or have left the party. Of those who have left almost 60 percent are Latvians, who made up only 39.2 percent of the party organization in any case. Their spontaneous departure is testimony to the flimsiness of their ideological convictions, their confusion, and the "muddying" of their consciousness with dubious slogans and appeals. It is a paradoxical fact that, at the same time, a whole number of leaders and ideologues attached to informal movements and parties who, one way or another, are encouraging ordinary Communist workers to make hasty decisions, continue to be Communist Party members and even occupy prominent positions in its structures!

At the congress, unfortunately, attacks by opposing sides were not a rarity. It became clearer and clearer that the compromises and solutions put forward in the political report and the documents submitted to the congress did not become the binding thread that had been hoped. Unfortunately, the threat of a split increased. Those who walked out of the congress met in a small auditorium. There the "independents" adopted a resolution to hold their constituent congress 14 April.

The congress continued. There were 516 delegates left in the auditorium. And each of the remaining delegates was well aware of the dramatic split and its serious political consequences for the republic. But perhaps a step should nonetheless be taken to meet each other halfway? Then there was a proposal to set up a conciliation commission. Representatives of both sides should meet and try to work out a joint solution. The delegates adopted this proposal unanimously. Moving somewhat ahead, we would note that during the elections of the new Central Committee the delegates unanimously decided to reserve one-third of the places on it.

The resolution adopted by the 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress noted that its Central Committee, while supporting perestroyka, had failed to take effective measures to implement its goals or to head the process of renewal within the party itself. The position in party organizations is complicated by ideological wavering and a loss of confidence in communist ideals among some communists.

New leading organs were elected. A.P. Rubiks was elected first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee. For many years he had been chairman of the Riga Gorispolkom [City Soviet Executive Committee]. Recently he has been chairman of the executive committee of the Latvian Working People's United Council of Labor Collectives.

The newly elected Central Committee was instructed to elaborate a Latvian Communist Party program to get the republic out of the crisis and to submit that program for examination by the congress. To that end, it was decided to have a break in the 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress before the end of the 28th CPSU Congress and to extend for this period the powers of delegates to the republic congress, during which draft Communist Party program documents will be discussed in primary party organizations.

The congress also adopted resolutions on the status of a renewed Latvian Communist Party and its priority organizational and statutory questions.

Vyalyas, Sillari Caution Estonians

PM1004080390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Apr 90 Second Edition p 2

[Own correspondent I. Teterin report: "Appeal to Working People"]

[Text] Tallinn, 8 Apr—The republic's newspapers yesterday published an appeal from V. Vyalyas, chairman of the Estonian Communist Party, and E.-A. Sillari, first secretary of the coalition Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, calling on communists to make a correct assessment of the processes taking place in the republic. The main issue currently facing the party and the people is how to ensure Estonia's balanced development toward state independence. Here it should be borne in mind, the appeal states, that there can be no independence based on political adventurism and simple solutions, just as there can be no new Estonia which denies the interests of certain national groups.

The document makes an assessment of the 30 March resolution of the Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet (on the Estonian SSR's status as a state). In particular, doubt is expressed about the correctness of using the concept of "occupation." Would it be correct from the standpoint of state law, the appeal asks, to talk about a continuing "occupation"? After all, we do not have organs of a military occupying power, and Estonian representatives have been elected to organs of power in the "occupying state." It was also proposed that an appeal be made to some prestigious international legal organ to obtain a dispassionate state-legal assessment of Estonia's current position.

In connection with the difficulties which could arise this spring during the draft of young Estonians for military service, V. Vyalyas and E.-A. Sillari proposed that the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet together with the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee "find an acceptable solution at the top level of the USSR and the Soviet Army." [as published]

The document ends with an appeal to all the republic's healthy forces to persistently strive for civic peace and cooperation and for a calm and businesslike solution to all problems.

Latvian People's Front Election Platform

90UN1069A Riga ATMODA in Russian 12 Feb 90 pp 2-3

[Latvian People's Front Election Platform for elections to the Supreme Soviet]

[Text] Dear Inhabitants of Latvia! The past year will go down in Latvia's history as one of liberalization and democratization brought about by the unequivocally expressed wishes of the public. Halting the processes of awakening occurring in East Europe, the Baltic and in many regions of the USSR is impossible. The Berlin Wall is coming down, the Prague Spring is being resurrected and communist parties are collapsing and losing power.

Where on the path of democratization obstacles are erected, the death throes of the old authorities cause totally innocent people to suffer. The Baltic peoples are proceeding shoulder to shoulder along the peaceful, democratic path toward their independence.

After 50 years of oppression, the Latvian people will for the first time have an opportunity to elect deputies who must implement the wishes of the people and their desire to achieve independence and prosperity. We must operate actively and purposively to prevent the kind of "elections" we had in 1940 and in the period of Stalinism and stagnation.

Voters! The time has come to choose. At the elections on 18 March we will express our wish—to live in a free, independent and democratic Latvia. We cannot permit our fate to be decided by indifference or chance.

Our goal is an independent Latvian state, which will develop the democratic parliamentary traditions of the Latvian Republic. An independent Latvia must be a state of political equality and freedom. The Latvian state must guarantee its inhabitants socioeconomic, political and personal rights and liberties, regardless of national, religious and party affiliation.

In the future Latvia must build peaceful, friendly and mutually profitable relations with all countries and should pay particular attention to a strengthening of unity and the elaboration of common positions with Estonia and Lithuania.

It is necessary to develop good-neighbor relations with the USSR and support mutually profitable economic cooperation.

Our Immediate Aims:

In the Political Sphere

The newly elected Latvian Supreme Soviet must create all the prerequisites contributing to the restoration of Latvia's state independence.

It is necessary first of all to issue a consistently objective decree on the liquidation of the consequences of the Molotov- Ribbentrop Pact, regarding as unlawful the enactments on the creation of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic and its entry into the USSR in 1940.

The Latvian Supreme Soviet must legislatively provide for the creation of a multiparty democracy and the elimination in Latvia of the CPSU's monopoly in the sphere of state power, administration and ideology.

In this connection the Latvian Supreme Soviet should:

—enact a law on the activity of political parties and public organizations guaranteeing their equality;

—legislatively put in the charge of the authorities elected by the people the property which appeared as a result of the fact that the CPSU assumed the functions of the state and managerial machinery;

—enact a law on the independence of radio, television and other mass media and determine the limits of information not subject to publicity and the conditions of its control;

—enact a law precluding political parties' interference in the organization of production processes and the control thereof and also in the activity of the law enforcement system and the sphere of education and culture;

—it is essential to put under the complete supervision of the Latvian Supreme Soviet the activity of the KGB, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Procuracy. It is necessary to determine the status of the USSR military contingent in Latvia, monitor its deployment and activity and superintend the troops' compliance with the laws of the Latvian Republic;

—to contribute to the creation of a national territorial army.

In the Sphere of Nationality Policy

It is essential following many decades of the policy imposed by the CPSU of a scornful attitude toward national interests to return to the democratic traditions of relations between people of different nationalities historically characteristic of Latvia. It is necessary to contribute to the Lettish nation's cooperation with all national communities residing on the territory of the republic in the creation of a democratic society in Latvia, the restoration of its state independence and the achievement of general prosperity.

The LPF [Latvian People's Front] is emphatically opposed to all attempts to split Latvia and form national territorial autonomous oblasts in Latgalia or other areas of the republic.

The Supreme Soviet must enact laws guaranteeing all national groups:

—the right to and possibility of developing their culture and acquiring education in their native language;

—the right to participate most extensively in the shaping of interethnic relations by way of the granting of the national groups an opportunity to participate via their representatives in the work of the parliamentary commissions and committees.

In the Sphere of Foreign Policy

Considering the interests of the Latvian Republic and also the peace treaty between Latvia and Russia concluded on 11 August 1920, the Latvian Supreme Soviet should immediately begin negotiations on the de facto restoration of the Latvian Republic.

The Supreme Soviet should:

—do everything possible to ensure this year Latvia's participation in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe;

—provide for the opening of Latvian representations abroad;

—adopt the necessary measures for the return of the overseas property of the Latvian Republic and its citizens.

In the Sphere of the Economy

It is necessary in this transitional period to restore control of the development of economic processes in Latvia.

Our main task is transforming the Latvian national economy on the basis of market economics, given observance of the conditions of nature conservation and improvement of the environment.

The Supreme Soviet must draw up the principles of legislation geared to a surmounting of the economic crisis in Latvia:

—it is necessary to recognize in the Latvian Constitution the right to private property and determine the equality of all forms of ownership and their protection by the state;

—to draw up laws protecting the republic's commodity market and to introduce throughout the republic a system of borders and customs;

—for the purpose of protection of the republic's financial resources it is necessary to create a national monetary system and form the Latvian Central Bank of Issue;

—for the purpose of regulation of the market economy it is necessary to devise and introduce a new taxation system;

—the enterprises of union jurisdiction located on Latvian territory should be subordinated to republic legislation and transferred to Latvian ownership. It is necessary to facilitate the transfer of unprofitable state-owned enterprises to the ownership of joint-stock (share) companies. The shareholders working at these enterprises participate in profit distribution and the process of enterprise management;

—it is necessary on the basis of republic legislation to ensure enterprises' economic independence and their right to form economic relations and to enact an anti-monopoly law protecting the interests of small businessmen;

—it is essential to conduct agrarian reform, making the land the property of those who wish to and can work it, taking account simultaneously of the right to ownership of the people whose property was nationalized and subjected to other kinds of illegal alienation.

The rural collective farms should gradually be converted to joint-stock (share) companies. The members of these companies' share of the collective property (proportionate both to their personal contribution and to the value of the property upon joining the collective farm) should be determined. This property is to be freely utilized and may be alienated upon withdrawal from the collective farm;

—to conduct a reform of the content and forms of work and also the wages of people working in the sphere of education, culture and the arts, health care and social security.

In the Social Sphere

New social legislation must balance the rapid processes of the material and social stratification of society which will develop as a consequence of the restructuring of the economy on a market basis.

While preventing a further impoverishment of broad strata of society, social legislation must not at the same time impede private initiative and enterprise.

The Supreme Soviet must:
—guarantee on a legislative basis protection of the individual and his rights, liberties and property from criminal threats and the arbitrary action of the authorities;

—by the introduction of a progressive taxation system guarantee each working person a wage no lower than the subsistence minimum;

—formulate a law on pensions providing for an increase in the minimum pension to the level of the subsistence minimum;

—eliminate the status of personal pensions and the limitations on maximum pensions and abolish pension limitations for working pensioners;

—instruct the government to devise and implement a special program pertaining to the protection of child and family;

—to provide upon the creation of the new system of taxation for the economic stimulation of charitable work;

—introduce on a legislative basis price indexation in order to increase wages, pensions and grants proportionate to the rise in prices;

—determine the minimum amount of paid leave at four weeks and abolish the "work Saturdays";

—introduce on a legislative basis insurance against unemployment voluntarily for workers and compulsorily for enterprises and provide on the basis of state resources for a worker-retraining program;

—instruct the government to immediately publish a map designating ecologically dangerous enterprises and embark on their modernization, reprofiling or closure;

—guarantee invalids living conditions worthy of man;

—enact a law determining the diversity of forms of ownership of accommodations (state, collective, private) and introduce differentiated payment, corresponding to consumer value, for state accommodations;

—pass a resolution on compensation for persons who unlawfully suffered punitive measures, demanding its payment from the USSR budget.

Voters! Let us attest to our mutual understanding, unity and unbending will!

Let there be power of the people and economic and social justice!

Each vote is important! Let us cast it for the candidates of the LPF!

Independent Latvian CP Draft Program Published

90UN1142A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 23 Feb 90 p 3

["The Basic Principles of Activity of an Independent Communist Party of Latvia (A Provisional Program)"]

[Text] **I. IDEOLOGICAL PROGRAM**

1. The party bases its activity on the priority of common human values over that of the interests of classes and social groups, and it places the interests of the people above the objectives of political parties.

The party serves the people of Latvia and the individual worker, and it rejects the claims of any class to a leading role in society. To achieve its objectives, it employs only non-violent and humane methods.

2. Recognizing that normal development of society is impossible without pluralism in the forms of property, ideas, and political organizations, we are for the cooperation of different social groups and political forces on the principles of partnership and against social and national confrontation in society.

Upholding the free competition of opinions and ideas, we reject monopoly by any ideology and the subordination of theoretical ideas to political dictates. The party should build its ideological platform in accordance with the course of development of society and by means of the results of its analysis.

3. We believe that the aspiration of the people for a life that an individual deserves can be satisfied by way of democratic socialism. Its ideas have roots in the democratic tradition of Europe and the experience of the world democratic movement, and also in the sociophilosophical teaching of Marx. All attempts in accordance with the doctrine of Marx to put his theoretical concepts about a communist society into practice, to create a model of just human relations, to implement the dictatorship of the proletariat, fully socializing the means of production and rejecting the market economy and political pluralism, have led to social devastation, injustice, and tragedy for people and whole nations. As a result, totalitarian administrative-bureaucratic socialism has developed in our society. In this connection, we reject as utopian the objective of building a communist society, because we do not see the capabilities and ways to implement it in contemporary society.

4. Democratic socialism is a society which dissociates itself in a fundamental way from the legacy of administrative-bureaucratic socialism, and it rests on two basic principles—freedom and social protection. Freedom in the political and ideological sphere denotes the observance of human rights, which has gained international recognition, the protection of citizens from the self-assumed power of state authority and the realization of self-government. Freedom in the economic sphere denotes a diversity of forms of property, the right of free initiative, and legal guarantees for the development of private property. The administrative-command system must be replaced by financial-legal regulation of the economy, and by the healthy competition of producers. Democratic socialism envisages and guarantees social justice according to the work contribution of each individual, and the creation of the kind of a system of taxes and social security that would provide a quality of life and development of culture that each individual in society deserves.

II. NATIONAL POLICY

1. The reason for the worsening of the national question in the USSR is the foreign and domestic policy of Stalinism, its crimes in national relations, and the imposition of unification and bureaucratic centralism. We acknowledge that the Communist Party of Latvia bears responsibility for the state of national relations that has developed in Latvia.

2. The reorganization of national relations, their democratization and humanization, and the creation in Latvia of a new model of cooperation among ethnic communities in ensuring the equal rights of all citizens of the republic, regardless of their national affiliations, are an integral component of the democratic perestroyka of society.

3. The state future of Latvia can be guaranteed only by all of the people of Latvia, and together with the Latvians are those national and ethnic groups that live permanently in Latvia, that have their historical roots here, and that tie their destiny to the future of Latvia. Laws must be created and implemented that guarantee national rights to all national and ethnic groups of Latvia. They must be granted independence on questions of culture and education (national cultural autonomy), and opportunities must be created to participate in the realization of state authority. Cultural-educational societies of national and ethnic groups must receive financial aid from the state budget.

4. A national policy should be implemented that responds to the interests of all nationalities of Latvia. The cornerstone of this policy is the proposition that the Latvian nation has an inalienable right to self-determination. For Letts and Livs, Latvia is the only place in the world where they can exist as nations, and where their language and culture can develop. Latvia must be a territorially indivisible sovereign state.

Taking the dramatic demographic situation of the Letts into account, we appeal to society to implement the necessary economic, social, and other types of measures for its substantial improvement.

5. We demand that the government of the republic consistently implement measures to ensure the functioning of the Latvian language in all spheres of state and public life, seeing to it that permanent residents of the republic know and use it. To ensure the consistent implementation of the Law on Languages with the simultaneous creation of conditions for society to master the language.

6. We support the requirements in the sphere of culture and the formation of an ethnographic group of the Latvian nation—the Latgals.

7. In the system of national education and instruction, both national and international education must be conducted.

8. We call on all nationalities to cooperate in censuring any kind of chauvinism, Russophobia and anti-Semitism, and the propaganda and practice of national intolerance and discrimination both in the past and in our time. We demand that the Latvian state respect and defend the national dignity and feelings of citizens.

III. THE PERESTROYKA OF THE POLITICAL SYSTEM

1. The political aim of the party is a socially just, open, democratic society in a free, independent, and rule-of-law Latvian state.

2. To move toward this objective, it is necessary fundamentally and irretrievably to dissociate oneself from the past errors and crimes of the Communist Party. Repressions and other mass crimes are recognized as genocide, and their initiators and executioners must be made personally answerable.

There should be an absolute rejection of those political and state forms and methods that assure the monopoly of authority of the administrative-command system.

3. In place of the administrative-command system, a constitutionally guaranteed system of sovereignty of the people and self-government should be formed.

4. It is necessary to accelerate the process of democratization of the society and the creation of a rule-of-law state.

We propose holding elections for state representative institutions every three years.

5. The state must serve the individual, and guarantee his rights, freedom, and social protection. Democratically elected state representative institutions must become the main mechanism for harmonizing interests. Public organizations, and parties among them, participate on the basis of an equal rights partnership and cooperation in the dialogue and political competition, and in democratic forms within bounds defined by the constitution. The government is formed on the principle of a political coalition.

6. A division and balance of authority must be realized, with assurance of real legislative authority of the elected institutions of popular representation, an executive authority that is subordinate to them, and an independent court that operates on the basis of law only.

7. The existence of organizations of political parties in the organs of state control, the Army, the KGB, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and other law enforcement organs, should be prohibited. Interference by the political parties in the process of government and in the organization and management of production is not permitted, nor is the inclusion of party organizations in the administrative structures of enterprises and institutions.

8. The adoption of socially just laws should be guaranteed. There must be a radical increase in the role of the people in the development, consideration, and adoption of laws. There should be a wide practice of adopting laws in referendums and an assurance of the introduction of principles and norms of internationally recognized rights in republic legislation.

All citizens, without any exception whatsoever, must have equal rights and responsibilities before the law.

9. We are for constitutionally guaranteed political pluralism and a multiparty system, rejecting a legally stipulated monopoly position and privileges in society of any party. Political parties in Latvia must be independent in their activity and organizational structure, and their leadership must be located on the territory of Latvia.

The role and place in society of public organizations and parties is determined by their authority and support among the people. The main indicator are the mandates obtained in democratic elections to institutions of popular representation at the pertinent level.

10. Basing ourselves on the right of nations to self-determination and the will of the people of Latvia, we are for the restoration of the state independence of Latvia by democratic methods that are in keeping with international law.

We believe that true stability in Europe is unattainable until the consequences of the criminal Hitler-Stalin pact with respect to Latvia are fully eliminated, and as long as Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia are the only European states that did not regain independence after the Second World War.

11. In the period of transition to the restoration of independence, it is necessary to logically implement the Declaration on the Sovereignty of Latvia and the Law on Economic Independence and to participate actively in the process of a radical restructuring in the Soviet Union.

12. In foreign policy, the internationally recognized representation of an independent Latvia in the UN and other international organizations should be achieved. Until recognition of state independence, it is necessary to support the participation of the Latvian SSR in the work of international non-state organizations.

Close political and economic cooperation of an independent Latvia with Lithuania and Estonia, based on treaties, and business and friendly cooperation with the USSR, must be established, and also inclusion in the process of European integration.

13. We are for the elimination of military-political alliances, nuclear disarmament, the formation of zones free of nuclear weapons in the Baltic area, and for the inclusion of Latvia in the nonaligned movement.

IV. THE NATIONAL ECONOMY AND THE SOCIAL SPHERE

1. The Communist Party of Latvia must assume full responsibility for errors committed in past years and the deformation in the economic policy of the republic, the result of which is extensive inefficient production, a dangerous ecological situation, a low quality of life of the population, and a lowering of the moral value of labor and of judiciously thrifty economic management.

2. It is necessary to implement the kind of an economic policy that would ensure the real economic independence of Latvia, a balanced, intensive, and ecologically safe development of the economy and prosperity, social security, and the development of the cultures of all residents of the republic.

3. A system of property relationships should be established that would give Latvia real rights and opportunities to manage the products it produces and its own budgetary resources. Equal legal, economic, and social rights must be guaranteed for the existence of state and

cooperative property, the property of public organizations, the private property of citizens, and the activity that pertains to these types of property of enterprises and farms, in order to ensure any resident of the republic, regardless of his social affiliations, nationality, profession, or political convictions, a quality of life that conforms to a civilized society.

4. All natural resources existing on the territory of Latvia should be made the real property of Latvia. All enterprises, associations, and farms must be gradually and logically released from directed administrative-departmental subordination, after providing for the economic self-government of local soviets of people's deputies with the introduction of their own convertible currency.

5. The development of commodity-monetary relations, equal rights contractual relations, and equivalent exchanges both on the domestic and foreign markets should be promoted, to the extent possible preserving and broadening all historically established and mutually beneficial partner relations in the social division of labor. Economic policy must be free of economic blockade, boycott, or restrictive discriminating conditions of a political and administrative nature.

6. The prevention of a crisis in the national economy will not be easy, and it will require of everyone an economical and conscientious use of all resources and of intensive, qualitative, and productive labor, economic initiative, and ideas, and personal responsibility. Therefore, we appeal to the residents of Latvia to participate actively in the development and implementation of the fundamental principles of economic policy, and also in the evaluation of results achieved by the national economy.

7. Inasmuch as forced collectivization and the unwarranted swift rates of industrialization and urbanization of the republic substantially impeded the development of agriculture, and also social and cultural life, the kind of economic structural policy that should be pursued relentlessly is one that would substantially stimulate a speedier and fuller surmounting of the great backwardness in these spheres.

8. Inasmuch as the automatic growth of the population of Latvia undoubtedly maintains the extensive nature of production and lowers even more the quality of our life, we should be concerned about putting into practice all the necessary economic, judicial, and social measures of a democratic nature to prevent this.

9. In order to radically improve the working conditions of the residents engaged in industry in the republic, and to create the technological base for raising the productivity of their labor, we should in every way possible promote the modernization of this branch and its rationally and carefully reasoned specialization, and, where it is expedient, also should reprofile the use of leased, joint stock, cooperative, and other forms of economic management with the simultaneous protection of the social interests of the workers.

10. Systematic agrarian reform must be conducted urgently. Together with the recognition of private property in land, the interests both of the former owners of the land and its current users must be taken into account, and the full rights of the owners to dispose of the output of their production freely must be assured, and they will achieve an equivalent exchange with other branches, the elimination of the social backwardness of the village, and a broad political representation of its residents in all organs of state authority. It is necessary to provide far greater support to farm households, to joint stock companies, and to cooperative associations.

11. The kind of financial policy must be put into effect that would ensure the creation of an independent banking, financial, and credit system, independence in the formation of a budget, and judicious expenditure of its resources. A socially fair tax system that stimulates production with progressive restraint of inflation and the formation of an opportunity to create its own freely convertible currency must be established. To protect the national economy, it is necessary for Latvia to establish its own customs system.

12. The direct the economic concern and responsibility of each producer to ensure a standard of living of the residents of Latvia that is appropriate for a civilized society must be placed at the base of social policy.

13. Free and independent trade unions that really protect the interests of the workers must be established in the republic immediately. The right of the workers to strike is recognized as a means of protection of socio-economic interests.

14. It is necessary to expand the economic independence of enterprises and their right to form economic ties, and also to adopt an antimonopolistic law for the protection of small and average enterprises and individual producers. Support should be given to all rational measures for the protection and stabilization of the domestic market of the republic in the interests of the population.

15. Given consistent support of commodity-monetary relations and the expansion of exchange on the basis of contractual relations, and also the creation of a civilized organized market, we should prudently control the level of prices and determine the coefficient of inflation, so that, after combining this with adequate social support of large families, pensioners, the temporarily unemployed, and other inadequately provided for members of society, a decrease in real incomes and a drop in the living standard of the residents of Latvia is prevented.

16. A principle of social justice that provides compensation for socially useful work and the establishment of a comprehensive system of social guarantees must be assumed as the basis of social policy. It must include disability allowances and old age pensions, both from the

state as well as from the pension fund that is formed through dues from the workers themselves, medical services on the basis of medical funds, subsidies for the producers of agricultural products, food coupons for the needy, unemployment allowances and retraining support, allowances for mothers and large families, adequate student living grants, and supplements to pay according to inflationary processes.

17. Funds for social guarantees must be created from direct and indirect taxes collected by the state, and also from public donations. The task of social guarantees is to provide everyone with a socially accepted living minimum under any circumstances; however, not restricting anyone's personal striving for one's own prosperity or the prosperity of one's family.

It is necessary to eliminate the system of social privileges.

18. Regarding pensioners working in the national economy, we support their receiving an entire salary and a full pension.

19. In implementing an ecological policy, we will press for the immediate development and adoption of the kind of laws that would stipulate a sufficiently high payment for natural resources, that would help create a system of ecological expert analysis, and also make it possible to apply stricter punishment and sanctions for the degradation of the environment, and to see to it that those departments to blame for this would correct the dangerous situation that has developed in many areas of the republic.

20. We call upon all citizens of Latvia to realize fully that the prosperity of the national economy depends directly on the real sovereignty of the republic, on a fundamentally new mechanism of economic management, and on our diligent, conscientious, creative, resource-saving quality labor to provide for the common economic and social interests of the population and for a full cultural life.

V. POLICY IN THE FIELD OF CULTURE AND EDUCATION

1. The aim of attempts at a radical reorganization of society is the formation of a free, creative, and moral person, and the development of a family, national, everyday ecological culture and a work culture.

2. Real freedom of conscience must be realized in society, and the priority or monopoly position in society of one world outlook and the politicization of cultural life are not permissible. We are for the broad introduction of the principle of choice in education and for the functioning of state and private educational institutions on the basis of equal rights.

3. The normal development of society is impossible without a free exchange of information. Each person has the right to demand and receive any information that relates to him. State enterprises must make public all information about the activity of these establishments, except that which the law declares cannot be divulged. Evidence of the past accumulated in the archives of Latvia (regardless of its departmental subordination) is the property of the people of Latvia, and archive funds that have a social significance must be transferred to the state archival system and be made accessible.

4. We believe that cultural activity and humanitarian culture cannot be developed only on the basis of self-financing. In the near future, there must be a significant increase in appropriations for the needs of education and culture.

5. An independent system of organizing education and science must be established in Latvia, and substantially expanded international contacts of prominent figures and institutions in Latvian education, culture, and science serve as a significant factor in the system's development.

6. The training of Latvian national personnel for the national economy of Latvia is an important task of the system of education and science of Latvia. We support the development of secondary education in the languages of the national groups of Latvia. In accordance with the capabilities of the republic and the interests of the citizens, higher education must be conducted in the Russian language and in the languages of other national groups. Defending the need to coordinate national education with the interests of cooperation of the nationalities of Latvia, we reject the establishment of new VUZ's [higher educational institution] along national lines.

The draft provisional program was prepared by a working group of the organizers of the conference of supporters of an independent Communist Party of Latvia. Recommendations on the draft under discussion can be submitted to the party committee of the University of Latvia: 226098, city of Riga, formerly Rajnisa, 19, telephone—22-37-47, 22-72-11, 22-72-62.

The conference will be held on 24 February, at 1000 hours, in the Political Education House.
[Signed]Conference organizational committee.

RSFSR

Moscow Voters Deputies' Criticize Lithuania Appeal

PM1004164390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 7 Apr 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Without Consulting the Voters: The Kind of Initiatives Some People's Deputies Are in a Hurry to Demonstrate"]

[Text] Lithuanian newspapers published a letter the other day addressed to the chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet by 73 deputies of the Moscow City Soviet, 21st Convocation. It said, in particular, the following: "We consider the forcible retention of your people and state within the framework of the USSR unacceptable. Mindful that a people which oppresses other peoples cannot be free, we condemn the interference of the USSR president and the USSR government in your republic's internal affairs."

Okay, no one is ashamed to voice his own opinion nowadays. Glasnost and pluralism of views are no longer merely declared but have actually become part and parcel of our lives. And that is a splendid thing. Since it is the best token of all of the establishment of democracy in our country, where it was, to put it mildly, for a long time in short supply.

But it seems that another shortage, that of responsibility for one's **word**, is beginning to be felt increasingly acutely. The people who signed that statement are not ordinary citizens. They were elected by the people to represent their interests and express their opinions. They will, of course, officially only receive their full powers at the first session of the new convocation, which will recognize such powers. It is therefore somewhat premature to act as deputies, but that is no longer so much a juridical question as an ethical one. But even that is not the point. Essentially, a question automatically arises here: Did the Moscow City Soviet deputies consult their voters before signing such a serious political document? Did they have for this the instructions and mandates of the Muscovites who elected them to the local organ of power?

According to the result of the runoff in Frunzenskiy Rayon's 456th and 461st Okrugs A. Zverev and A. Artishchev were elected to the Moscow City Soviet. TASS correspondent I. Shamshin put a number of questions to Muscovites who took part in the runoff elections.

"Did you personally give your deputy a mandate to act in that way? Do you know whether your deputy consulted other voters in the okrug on this problem? How do you personally regard such a political step by your deputy?"

A. Ivanov, engineer:

"I gave no such mandate. I personally am unaware of it, but it may be that some people did speak at election meetings where I was not present. In today's difficult situation I consider such behavior disgraceful political recklessness. To be honest, I would support Zverev's recall from the Moscow City Soviet for such actions."

M. Spiridonov, employee:

"I did not, and I am in the dark. I feel sorry for the Russians who are being thoroughly hounded in the Baltic. I have a friend who lives in Tallinn. He's having a tough time there now. If my deputy wants to heat up emotions, I am against such a deputy."

E. Prokhorova, housewife:

"I did not go to any meeting with candidates. I am a sick person. I spent 10 years in Stalin's camps for anti-Soviet propaganda. I do not like everything that the communists have done. They occupied Lithuania. Artishchev has my mandate to fight for Lithuanians' freedom. Our people are politically backward. There are still too few people who have the civic courage to back the Baltic."

S. Chernyak was elected in Cheremushkinskiy Rayon's 467th Territorial Okrug. How, then, did the deputy get to know voters' opinion? Was it at meetings or as a result of polls perhaps?

"No, there has been nothing of that kind. I have heard nothing about such and have never come across any announcements inviting inhabitants to meet together," R. Karyakina, worker at the N. Gorbunov Institute, said in response to the TASS correspondent's question. "Such appeals can, of course, be adopted only as a result of public referendums. No one asked us, however, whether we agreed or not. This should not be repeated."

"How do you assess the deputy's actions?" "I think that he is no people's deputy if he speaks on behalf of the people without consulting them," was how A. Kononov answered the question.

None of the ten inhabitants of Electoral Okrug Nos. 474 and 483 whom we questioned had given their deputies, L. Sholpo and A. Pogorilyy, any mandate whatsoever on problems regarding the independence of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. Nor did they know anything about any meetings between the aforementioned deputies and their voters on the "Lithuanian question" which might have taken place.

Most people condemned the political initiative of the 73 Moscow City Soviet deputies. Two pensioners and a military man said that they "must be recalled for it."

Yes, as is clear, the newly elected deputies were in a hurry to demonstrate their perfervid but essentially independent activity. And they did manage to get off a protest to the USSR President, claiming that his actions and statements, just like those of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU Platform), "constitute a challenge to the Lithuanian people, aggravate tension in Lithuania, and pose a serious danger to the peaceful development of the political process in our country."

That's it: no more, no less. If one follows the logic of the authors of the protests, no one is more concerned than they about the current situation in Lithuanian—neither the president, nor the Congress of People's Deputies, nor the country's Supreme Soviet, nor the government. Only Moscow City Soviet deputies—Yu. Vorobyev, Yu. Khramov, Yu. Pelageychenko, Yu. Yemelyanov, V. Koveshnikov, A. Dryzhenko, and a few dozen other deputies.

Truth to tell, certain Leningraders did not lag behind the Muscovites in this desire to pillory first and only then look into the matter. After the elections the first thing they did was to send a telegram to Moscow: "We demand... that the use of military force be ruled out and that direct talks start forthwith." Who was it, then, who imagined "military force?" The following figure among the 34 signatures on the telegram: "People's Deputies of the RSFSR Kurkova, Formozov, Solye, Kiselev, Varov, Kucherenko, Nesterov, Boltyanskiy, Dmitriyev," and others along with newly elected deputies of the Leningrad City Soviet.

How is this unrestrained haste evaluated by those of whose rights some deputies make themselves out to be the defenders?

"We are deeply incensed" reads part of the assessment of participants in the expanded plenum of the Klaipeda Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU Platform) Gorkom [city party committee]. The Klaipeda communists quite reasonably think this way: "It is incomprehensible how these deputies could welcome the already burgeoning restoration of bourgeois practices in Lithuania."

Support for the separatist aspirations of a section of the inhabitants of Lithuania is incompatible, according to plenum participants, with the lofty vocation of people's deputy. Klaipeda communists expressed the hope that "Moscow, Leningrad, and Kaliningrad voters will have their say about whether deputies who would destroy the unity of our multinational state are needed."

'Passions' Mar Preparations for Russian Congress

PM1004153790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Apr 90 Second Edition p 3

[Report by O. Sergeyev: "Ignoring Standing Orders"]

[Text] The first lines marking the contours of the future Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] People's Deputies have now been drawn. It has been announced that the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies Preparatory Commission began work on 4 April in the RSFSR House of Soviets.

The first plenary session of the deputies' commission was opened by V.I. Vorotnikov, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, which, in accordance with legislation, has the task of convening and preparing for the Congress.

The amount of information and the problems that inundated the deputies from the outset was so great that, when it was proposed that the duration of the working sessions should be confined to daylight hours, one of the deputies resolutely demanded that they do as much work as necessary. The wish was endorsed despite the fact that, as V.I. Vorotnikov ironically observed, in some republican parliaments it is now "fashionable to make decisions at night."

There was a lively reaction to the announcement that, on behalf of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, People's Deputy T.G. Ivanova, one of the three women attending the session, had been given the job of coordinating and organizing the work of the Preparatory Commission. It has to be said that the male majority swiftly agreed to female coordination of their activity.

What questions is the Preparatory Commission tackling at the moment? The deputies have formed six subcommissions, each of which has taken on a specific group of congress issues. They include the elaboration of proposals on the agenda, the procedure for holding the Congress sittings and the session, and the formation of the Congress' working organs and a body to deal with procedural matters. The deputies' subcommissions have embarked on the elaboration of proposals on data and information services for the Congress and session and work with people's deputies. A separate subcommission is discussing proposals connected with the election of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. The deputies are also preparing proposals on draft laws which could be examined at the Congress.

However, the status of the actual commission and its work procedure were the very first questions that had to be discussed.

People's Deputy B.D. Babayev from Ivanovo proposed widening the jurisdiction of the Preparatory Commission to ensure the immediate adoption of its recommendations on certain questions. But People's Deputy I.M. Bratishchev from Rostov-na-Donu urged that all the main Congress questions should be resolved, if possible, at the commission. On the other hand, some Moscow deputies actually proposed restricting the status of the Preparatory Commission, whose members have gotten their authority from territorial deputies' groups, reducing it to the status of an association of deputies representing specific interests. The majority of deputies rejected this approach.

Naturally, organizational matters were not the deputies' sole preoccupation. The general mood was reflected by V.I. Vorotnikov's proposal that the Preparatory Commission should pay more attention to questions of legislative proposals on the solution of pressing problems of life in the RSFSR, which could be considered at the Congress and session. The Congress must not only be organizational in nature but must also, from the outset, serve the idea of the national-state rebirth of the RSFSR, which the majority of elected deputies upheld in their election programs.

Unfortunately, the first days of its work showed that an unnecessary overheating of passions was unavoidable. An apparently technical question, raised by People's Deputy P.D. Kuritsyn from Petrozavodsk, on the need to accommodate deputies not in double (as was the previous Supreme Soviet's practice), but in single rooms had an unexpected sequel. Deputies later joked that there had been a "hotel bed crisis" in the commission's work. Despite the fact that Presidium personnel promised to resolve and actually did swiftly resolve this problem in a practical way, a number of deputies who, by dint of their place of residence, did not require hotel rooms developed the theme in a most unexpected way. People's Deputy S.N. Krasavchenko, deputy chief editor of the journal VOPROSY EKONOMIKI, gave the "issue" the character of a confrontation between the Russian state leadership and certain Moscow deputies.

It is a pity that time was wasted on such "issues."

RSFSR Official Views Economic Independence

LD1004214190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] The drafting of an important document, the outline for economic independence of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], is being completed by the government of the Russian Federation. As is known, Russia is to transfer to new conditions of management from 1 January of next year. What are the main aspects of this outline, what are its main features? Valeriy Petrovich Chichkanov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, speaks about this in a conversation with our correspondent Valeriy Kiosa.

[Begin recording] [Chichkanov] I would begin with the fundamental principles of this outline. The first is that the country has to take priority. We would not wish to be egoists and to live at the expense of other republics, or live at the expense of other regions. Incidentally, this is not a simple principle, it is a principle which, regrettably, has been forgotten in the outlines of some republics. The second principle is the principle which we call the principle of social justice. This concerns the fact that if a territory is working well, then it should live well, too. The next principle is that of the integrated approach to assessing the efficiency of a territory's work. That is, in this we take as a premise that not only an economic return as a social return and, without fail, an ecological return. Everything must be directed toward enhancing the efficiency of enterprises, of this or that organization or association. Only this basis will make it possible to meet the following aim, which is to increase the republic's contribution to the development of the country's national economic complex, because every republic is a part of the country's national economic complex, the speeding up of resolution of social problems, and, naturally, improvement of the quality of life of Russia's population.

What is there that is new in principle in this outline? It is the total economic independence of the republic. In the near future there will be a reform of price formation. That means that all prices for production and especially raw materials—oil, gas, coal, non-ferrous metals—will be brought closer to world prices. We will be selling this produce according to these prices, and so we will be trading with other republics on an equivalent basis.

[Kiosa] And so, the work on the outline for economic sovereignty of Russia is nearing completion. How will it be put into practice in the future?

[Chichkanov] We expect to publish this outline, so that everyone who wishes to can take part in the discussion. Then it will be finalized and submitted for the judgement of the RSFSR people's deputies. [end recording]

Moscow Rayon Named for Voroshilov Renamed

PM0304150190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent R. Ignatyev report: "Moscow Rayon Renamed"]

[Excerpt] By decree of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium, Moscow City's Voroshilovskiy Rayon was renamed Khoroshevskiy Rayon 30 March 1990.

"This decision has been made in connection with the wishes of residents and various organizations in the rayon itself and the local leadership," this IZVESTIYA correspondent was told by V. Saykin, chairman of Moscow Gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee]. [passage omitted]

Bashkir Supreme Soviet Elects Chairman

LD0704035990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 6 Apr 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Correspondent M. Gafurov, identified by screen caption] Approximately 80 percent of the deputies [at the first session of the Bashkir ASSR (Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic) Supreme Soviet] have been elected for the first time. Unfortunately, they include very few workers and collective farmers. There are only 13 women. Many problems have accumulated in the republic. The most important are food, housing, the ecological situation, interethnic relations, law and order. The previous leadership of Bashkiria, headed by Comrade Khabibullin, of the obkom first secretary, who was compelled to resign this February, was not able to resolve these problems. Today the session is deciding organizational questions. Eight candidates were put forward for the post of Supreme Soviet chairman. Two deputies withdrew their names. Each of the candidates explained his program.

The election took place in two rounds. In the first round not one of the contestants obtained the necessary number of votes. The second round was contested by Murtaza Gubaydullovich Rakhimov, director of the Ufa oil refinery and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and (Marat Kashatovich Ryzbayev) first secretary of Sterlitamak Gorkom (city party committee). The majority of deputies voted for Rakhimov.

Two deputy chairmen of the Supreme Soviet and the chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers were also elected. The session then adjourned its work until 16 April.

Gusev Elected to Sverdlovsk Post

LD0804050490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 7 Apr 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Our correspondent in Sverdlovsk has informed us over the phone that out of four candidates, it was Aleksandr Petrovich Gusev who has been elected by the overwhelming majority of votes as the first secretary of the Sverdlovsk oblast party committee. He previously worked as the first secretary of the city party committee of the town of Asbest.

Ulyanovsk Obkom First Secretary Elected

PM1004113590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Apr 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Enhancing Communists' Responsibility"]

[Text] Ulyanovsk—The debate on the review report at the 22d Ulyanovsk Oblast review and election conference—which ended yesterday—lasted for two days.

The conference participants emphasized that the oblast party leadership had not managed to avoid serious mistakes. Especially in combating bureaucracy and asserting the principles of social justice, developing glasnost in the work of party and soviet organs, strengthening the independence of primary party organizations, and enhancing the ideological conviction, initiative, and responsibility of every communist. It was no accident that a wave of rallies swamped Ulyanovsk in February, where demands such as "Obkom [oblast party committee] bureau—resign!" were put forward and where justified claims were raised against obkom secretaries and bureau members who had failed to master political methods of work with the masses in line with the rapidly changing current situation. A number of delegates criticized the CPSU Central Committee. Speakers urged that everything necessary should be done to preserve the unity of the party's ranks under the banner of humanization, democratization, and perestroyka.

It was decided to hold the second and final part of the conference in early June, to sum up the results of the oblast debate on the draft new CPSU Program and Statutes in order to elaborate on this basis a united plaform for the Ulyanovsk delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress and the constituent congress of the Russian Communist Party.

There were 20 candidacies for the post of first secretary. After a debate two names were entered for election by secret ballot. Yu.F. Goryachev, chairman of the oblast soviet of people's deputies, was elected first secretary of Ulyanovsk CPSU Obkom by an overwhelming majority.

The conference was attended by G.A. Zyuganov, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department.

Unscheduled Ivanov Leningrad TV Speech Reported

PM1004102390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by Dmitriy Yefremov under the rubric "Direct Line; IZVESTIYA Correspondents at the Teleprinter": "Extraordinary Occurrence on Leningrad Television"]

[Text] Leningrad—The popular Leningrad program "600 seconds" was unexpectedly extended on the evening of 6 April.

In the past month USSR People's Deputy N. Ivanov has twice spoken live on Leningrad television. He described a new twist in the "Gdlyan-Ivanov" case and promised that he would speak once again 5 April to announce additional details "with the facts to hand." But a day before this B. Petrov, chairman of the Leningrad committee for television and radio broadcasting, told television viewers that N. Ivanov's speech was being taken off.

At the recent first session of the Leningrad soviet of the new convocation debates began on this subject as a result of which it was decided to transfer Leningrad television to the control of the Leningrad City Soviet, to relieve B. Petrov of his post, and to give N. Ivanov the opportunity to speak.

I shall not touch now on the question of the competence of these decisions (in particular, the Leningrad television studio is the property of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting). Events then developed as follows.

On Friday evening at the very end of the "600 seconds" program its presenter, A. Nevzorov, gave his place to N. Ivanov. Live broadcasting was immediately turned off. But after a brief pause filled with a documentary movie, the announcer said there had been a change of program schedule: N. Ivanov would speak.

I immediately telephoned V. Bolgarchuk, deputy chief editor of the television and radio broadcasting committee's main information and propaganda editorial office, at his home. He said that at 2000 hours he had left the studio and everything was quiet there. "It is hooliganism," was how he assessed the "600 seconds" program incident.

A little later the television workers said that several dozen Leningrad Soviet deputies together with N. Ivanov had arrived at the studio in the evening with the Leningrad Soviet decision. With them was V. Senin, deputy chairman of the Leningrad Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, who made the changes to the program schedule.

An intolerable, extraordinary situation occurred—that is how the leaders of the Leningrad television committee assessed the incident.

Russian Christian Democratic Movement Launched

LD0904203790 Moscow TASS in English 2019 GMT 9 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 9 TASS—The constituent congress of the Russian Christian Democratic Movement was held here today. Its participants adopted the rules, programme and the declaration of this political party.

The Russian Christian Democratic Movement favours the preparation for and convocation of an all-Russia council which, in the opinion of this organisation's members, is called upon to restore "the interrupted (by the revolution) continuity of legal supreme power in Russia."

The movement believes that only an all-Russia council is competent to resolve the question on the form of a state system in Russia. Movement members regard the period before the convocation of an all-Russia council as a "transition period" and, naturally, the present organs of legislative, executive and judicial power as "temporary" until an all-Russia council is convened.

In the economic sphere, the movement advocates a multistructural economy and equality of all forms of property, including private.

The new party intends to campaign for winning power. The dean of the Borisoglebsk Church in the city of Obninsk, Vyacheslav Polosin, one of the party's leaders and deputy to parliament of the Russian Federation, said that a Christian Democratic group was set up in the new parliament of the Russian Federation.

According to him, intellectuals, pensioners and the clergy make up the majority in the party. There are also 16-year-old young people who, according to the movement's rules, may be members of the movement.

First Independent Radio Station To Be Set Up

LD0804043390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Text] It has been decided to set up the first public radio station that will be independent from state structures in Moscow. It will operate around the clock and broadcast music, news, advertisements, and sports. It will be called M-Radio. This station will be a joint Soviet-French enterprise, a considerable part of the income of which will be used for charitable purposes.

IZVESTIYA Apologizes for Alleged Story

PM1303151990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Unattributed report under the "Follow-up" rubric: "'Mineral Resources and Department'"]

[Text] IZVESTIYA No. 295 in 1988 published an economic review by Yu. Grinko headlined "Oil Stocks and the Department," which criticized the "Udmurtneft" Production Association, along with virtually the entire policy of the then USSR Ministry of the Chemical and Petroleum Refining Industry, which aimed, the review indicated, "to conceal some stocks from the state" and create "a reserve to easily fulfill artificially low plans and obtain undeserved incentives." IZVESTIYA No. 38 last year carried a response from V. Dinkov, then minister of the petroleum industry, which announced that the USSR Ministry of the Chemical and Petroleum Refining Industry collegium deemed the article in IZVESTIYA "unobjective and incompetent" with a "great number of incorrect opinions and conclusions." At the same time specialists who sent responses to the article supported it by and large. The dispute developed further at the Frunzenskiy Rayon People's Court in Moscow, where the "Udmurtneft" Production Association leadership and collective brought an action, in an attempt to refute the report in the article "Oil Stocks and the Department." After studying the findings of competent bodies and specialists attached to the case materials, the court concluded that the "report set out in the article 'Oil Stocks and the Departmen' concerning the 'Udmurtneft' Production Association's undue understatement of its annual petroleum extraction and breach of the legislation on mineral resources when mining the deposit, and the attempt to salt away some stocks in order to easily fulfill understated plans with a view to obtaining undeserved awards and incentives are to be deemed untrue."

The decision in question was subsequently confirmed by a Moscow City Court Presidium resolution of 22 November last year and by an RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Court response to IZVESTIYA of 20 February 1990.

In this connection the editorial office apologizes to the people and organizations that were subjected to unfounded criticism in the review "Oil Stocks and the Department." At the same time we announce that the question of the author's responsibility was not considered since Yu. Grinko does not now work for IZVESTIYA.

Western Republics

Rukh Leader Opposed to Secession of Ukraine

AU1104131590 Prague MLADA FRONTA in Czech 5 Apr 90 p 5

[Interview with Anatoliy Shevchenko, chief editor of NARODNA GAZETA, organ of the Ukrainianian Rukh civic movement, by Jii Doubrava, MLADA FRONTA correspondent in the USSR, in Kiev; no date given: "Ukrainian Civic Movement and its Goals; Rukh or Quest for Nation"—opening paragraph is MLADA FRONTA introduction]

[Text] Anatoliy Shevchenko is chief editor of the new Ukrainian newspaper NARODNA GAZETA, organ of the Rukh civic movment. Our permanent correspondent in the USSR spoke to him in Kiev. First he asked for something like a visiting card, an encyclopedia entry for Rukh.

[Shevchenko] The goal of our movement is the economic and political independence of the Ukraine. In other words, independence for a nation which must have the right of self-determination. So far, it is not so—everything, economic as well as political life, is subjected to the Soviet Union. Everything must be confirmed by Moscow and that includes the granting of academic titles as well as theater programs. We want independence that does not exist on paper but in reality.

[Doubrava] Is Rukh a political party?

[Shevchenko] No, we are not, and do not want to be a party in spite of entering the elections with our own candidates. A political party can come into existence on the basis of the program of Rukh, but it will not originate in the Rukh as such.

[Doubrava] This model is reminiscent of the Czechoslovak Civic Forum. Did you look into its experiences?

[Shevchenko] Yes, but do not forget that we organized several months earlier. Our constituent conference took place in July and the congress in September.

[Doubrava] What is your membership?

[Shevchenko] A million, maybe two. We do not know exactly because we are just in the process of preparing a new registration. There are no paid officials.

[Doubrava] Are there communist members of Rukh?

[Shevchenko] Yes, but they are leaving the Communist Party. Just these days the Rukh representatives returned their membership cards. Its chairman, the writer Ivan Drach, was among them.

[Doubrava] How do you want to contribute to the Ukraine's acquisition of greater measure of independence?

[Shevchenko] It suffices to look at the Soviet history textbooks and everything is obvious. The history of the Ukraine, according to them, begins in the eighteenth century. That is not true, though. The Ukraine is greatly russified. The Russification began already under Stalin, who had our leading personalities shot. It is of interest to note that the Ukrainians for years considered joining their territory to Russia to be the least of all possible evils. After all, the others to be considered were Turks, Poles, or Swedes. We have to explain all this.

[Doubrava] Let me ask a provocative question. The Ukraine has rich natural resources including oil and coal, and excellent conditions for agriculture. What do you need the Soviet Union for?

[Shevchenko] Sir, you speak like Rukh!

[Doubrava] That is, I think, exactly what I did not want. So, seriously now—are you asking for separation from the Soviet Union?

[Shevchenko] Seriously, the national sentiment of our people is not on the level of, for instance, people in Lithuania. How can we ask for separation? We want above all to live in a different Soviet Union. A Soviet Union that will be entirely different, and where we ourselves will decide about our country.

Ukrainian Group Denounces Lithuanian Leaders

LD0904220190 Moscow TASS in English 2050 GMT 9 Apr 90

[Text] Kiev April 10 TASS—The Union of Working People for Socialist Reorganisation, a mass Ukrainian organisation, expressed its concern over "illegal acts" adopted by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet.

"We are convinced that the course for separation, hasty and reckless actions aimed to secede from the USSR will not benefit either our entire country or Lithuania," says a statement adopted by the Union's Presidium here on Monday.

The document calls attention to the fact that Sajudis deputies "who fervently championed democracy and human rights recently, now approve laws promising severe punishment for the so-called anti-state calls, that is for disagreement with the nationalist and separatist policy of the present Lithuanian leadership."

The statement denounces a similar position of some fronts and movements in other republics, including the Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka (Rukh).

"The present-day Rukh means the fanning up of nationalist sentiments, attacks on communists and desire to use any pretext to destabilise the situation in the republic and, last but not least, blatant disrespect for calls and instructions of government bodies," says the statement.

"The above is also corroborated by unauthorised actions recently held in support of Lithuanian separatists at its initiative."

The Union of Ukrainian Working People states that "it will resolutely oppose any attempt to destroy rather than revitalise the Soviet federation and to sow hatred and mistrust for political, ethnic and religious reasons."

Ukrainian Democratic Bloc Deputies Meet

LD0904103390 Kiev International Service in English 2330 GMT 8 Apr 90

[Text] A conference of Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [UkSSR] people's deputies representing the republic's Democratic Bloc has been held in Kiev. Taking part were deputies sponsored by Rukh [Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka], the Ukrainian Helsinki Union, and the Ukrainian Language, Green World, and memorial societies, strike committees, and also USSR people's deputies from the Ukraine. At the meeting, several other UkSSR people's deputies joined the Democratic Bloc fraction.

The main questions at the meeting were the strategy and tactics of parliamentary activities. It was decided that the deputies representing the Democratic Bloc would join in a parliamentary group, which is supposed to work for deepening the process of democratization in the Ukraine.

First Secretary Ivashko Visits Donetsk Oblast

Visits Industrial Workers

LD1004124290 Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 0230 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] Vladimir Ivashko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine Central Committee, stayed in Donetsk Oblast from 4 to 7 April. He met with party workers, industrial and agricultural workers, and scientists. The exchanges concerned the course of restructuring in the Ukraine, the role and place of the party in new conditions, and preparations to the 28th congresses of the CPSU and the Communist Party of the Ukraine. Special stress was laid on the responsibility of every communist during the present stage of the revival of society.

The party organization of the Azovstal plant in Mariupol is the largest in the oblast. It is not for nothing that this enterprise is called a giant of Soviet metallurgy. In the newly constructed electric steel smelting shop, the first secretary talked with workers, answered their numerous questions, inquired on how ecological problems are being solved, and about the availability of consumer goods.

While meeting with animal breeders of the Mariupolskiy state farm, he stressed the significance of specialization in solving the food problem and the need to improve the working and living conditions of rural workers.

Comrade Ivashko then visited the Kalinin coal mine and went underground and acquainted himself with working conditions of miners. Here all attention was focused on fulfilment of the USSR Council of Ministers' decision No.608, and on the construction of housing and social facilities.

At the Economy and Industry Institute of the Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic Academy of Sciences, the first secretary met with leading scientist, miners' leaders, and (?made a speech).

Speaks at Election Conference

LD0804051190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Excerpts] An oblast party report-back and election conference ended its work in Donetsk today. [passage omitted] Ivashko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, spoke at the conference.

Ukraine Appeals for Post-Chernobyl Foreign Aid

LD0904191590 Moscow TASS in English 1855 GMT 9 Apr 90

[Text] Kiev April 9 TASS—The Ukrainian government has issued an appeal to the governments and citizens of other countries and to international organisations. It asks for assistance and interaction in cleaning up consequences of the 1986 Chernobyl atomic power plant disaster.

The appeal notes that a considerable part of the Ukraine's territory is contaminated by radioactive fallout, and 1,614 residential centres are situated in the danger zone.

High priority clean-up tasks have been accomplished by the Ukrainian republican and the Soviet Federal Governments. Aid from international organisations, foreign scientists and citizens is warmly appreciated. But the situation continues to cause serious apprehension.

A large amount of radio nuclides with a long period of decay are still concentrated in the destroyed fourth power unit and numerous provisional burial places in the very centre of Eastern Europe. Human health and natural environment are seriously affected, it has been found out.

In order to reduce this influence it is necessary to carry out an immense amount of work. A comprehensive clean-up programe has been drawn up in the Ukraine, but huge investments are needed to implement this programme.

The republican government, the appeal stresses, hopes for aid and support from the international community to solve these vital problems. The republic's priority requirements are connected with the need to ensure reliable sanitary and medical services to the population residing in the contaminated areas. The republic needs effective technologies to process radioactive waste and decontaminate land and machinery to work in areas affected by the Chernobyl disaster.

Measures Adopted To Assist Chernobyl Victims

LD0704025190 Moscow TASS in English 2248 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 7 TASS—The Soviet Council of Ministers and the USSR Central Council of Trade Unions have adopted a resolution on measures to improve medical service and social security of people who took part in the Chernobyl clean-up operation.

The Ministry of Public Health, the Defence Ministry, the Interior Ministry, the State Security Committee, other ministries, institutions and Councils of Ministers of

Union republics were assigned to organise in 1990 an additional medical check-up of all those who took part in the Chernobyl clean-up operation within the range of 30 kilometers from the power plant (the zone from which people were evacuated), a regular medical control over the state of their health and medical treatment. They were also assigned to keep a single record of people affected by irradiation (state register) on the basis of the all-union distribution register and to create regional and departmental rehabilitation centres in 1990-92.

Participants in the Chernobyl clean-up operation were given a number of privileges, which will be introduced on July 1, 1990.

Decree Issued on Vacations for Chernobyl Children

LD0704114190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1014 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 7 Apr (TASS)—The following decree of the USSR president was promulgated here today:

"On measures to assist children living in the zone affected by the consequences of the Chernobyl atomic power station accident"

The mothers of children living in the zone of radioactive contamination ensuing from the accident at the Chernobyl atomic power station have made a request to work collectives and the trade union organizations of the Union republics of the USSR to assist in providing for the vacation and convalescence of children and teenagers during the summer period.

1. I ask the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] to take charge of and organize the work of providing for the vacations and treatment of children from the stricken areas of Belorussia, the Ukraine, and Bryansk Oblast of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] in the country's medical and convalescent establishments.

I instruct Union ministries and departments and the Councils of Ministers of Union republics, during the period up to 1 May 1990, at the requests of the AUCCTU to allocate a quota of warrants sufficient for providing vacations to all children from the stricken areas that are in need of them at sanatoriums, vacation homes, boarding houses, and pioneer camps irrespective of which department they come under.

2. I instruct the USSR Council of Ministers to hand over the Ay- Danil sanatorium of the Treatment and Convalescence Association under the USSR Council of Ministers to the USSR Ministry of Health for this special purpose—the treatment and rehabilitation of children (if need be, together with their parents) from the stricken areas.

The hand over of the sanatorium and its ancillary facilities and services is to be implemented during the period prior to 1 May of this year, maintaining existing staff levels and conditions of material provisions for vacationers and service personnel.

Comrade I.N. Denisov, USSR first deputy health minister, is entrusted with personal responsibility for the special purpose use of the Ay-Danil sanatorium and the maintenance in it of high-quality medical services for the children.
[Dated] The Kremlin, Moscow, 7 April 1990
[Signed] M.S. Gorbachev, USSR President.

Kebich Selected as New Belorussian Premier

LD0704143990 Moscow TASS in English 1421 GMT 7 Apr 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Glod]

[Text] Minsk April 7 TASS—Belorussian Supreme Soviet Presidium retired Belorussian Prime Minister Mikhail Kovalev at his own request today, replacing him with Vyacheslav Kebich, 54, a maverick reformer, who is known for his easy handling of the media.

Kebich won popularity for advocating Belorussia's economic reforms and promoting cost-accounting and self-financing in the past two years. From December 1985, Kebich served as the head of the republic's Planning Committee. Many attribute Belorussia's relative economic success as compared to other Soviet republics over the past few years to him.

Belorussian Party Plenum Elects New Leaders

LD1004170290 Minsk ZVYAZDA in Belorussian 28 Mar 90 p 1

["On the Plenum of the Communist Party of Belorussia Central Committee"]

[Summary] A plenum of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee was held on 27 March. It discussed the date for convening the 31st congress of the CP of Belorussia.

An organizational question was examined.

In connection with the appointment of Comrade N. Igrunov to the post of chief editor of the magazine PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN, which is published under the auspices of the CPSU Central Committee, he was released from his duties as second secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee.

In connection with his retirement, Comrade V. Lepeshkin was released from the post of Secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee.

By secret ballot A.S. Kamay was elected second secretary and A.I. Trutnev secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee. Both are Belorussians. A. Kamay was born in 1936; A. Trutnev was born in 1938.

Belorussian Presidium Appeals for Order

90UN1305B Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 24 Feb 90 p 1

[Appeal of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Belorussian SSR to the citizens of Belorussia, adopted at a meeting of the Presidium of the Belorussian SSR on 22 February 1990]

[Text] Dear Comrades!

A complicated sociopolitical situation has developed recently in the country and the republic.

The problems in political life, the economy, and the social sphere that have been accumulating over the years have been painfully aggravated. To these have been added the mistakes and omissions made during the course of perestroyka. The consumer market has become unbalanced, discipline has declined, crime is on the rise, and the ecological situation has worsened. The society is in an unstable condition and the wave of conflicts among people is growing.

In this complex situation there is appreciable activity on the part of people who have nothing to do with creative work and democracy. An extreme manifestation of this kind of activity were the calls for various kinds of overthrows, resistance to the authorities, and inflammation of ethnic discord. The social tension is being fanned, the situation is becoming destabilized, and there is a lack of respect for the law.

All this is causing justifiable concern among the majority of the population.

The Presidium of the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, the state and party organs, and the mass media are receiving many letters and statements from workers demanding that our socialist system protect them from such actions, halt the aggravation of the situation of civil confrontation, and protect the rights and liberties of the citizens.

Taking into account the seriousness of today's situation, the Presidium of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet considers it necessary to take all measures to put a halt to any attempts to stir up ethnic hatred, hostility, violence, and the provocation of disturbances. All forces and means envisioned by the Belorussian SSR will be used to achieve these ends.

At the same time, the Presidium of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet expresses the hope that the residents of the republic will not respond to the irresponsible appeals from instigators and will show reason and restraint, political and everyday wisdom, and common sense. Let us not forget the sad experience of the inflaming of passions at rallies, the victims of which were innocent people, women, children, and the elderly.

This is why, dear compatriots, when they call for you to participate in more rallies, strikes, and acts of civil disobedience, think and be aware of what this can lead to, and think about whether this will improve our common situation or, on the contrary, whether it will complicate things and make them worse.

Healthy forces in society cannot and should not take a passive position and play the role of observers at a time when all kinds of extremists are attacking the main achievement of perestroyka—democracy. We must reliably protect it if we want it to be worth anything. In order to achieve this noble goal it is necessary to consolidate all the healthy forces of society. Only self-imposed discipline and order will help us to arrive at our proclaimed goal—humane democratic socialism.

Today is not a time for mutual ultimatums and accusations; today is a time for coordinated actions for the good of society and for the good of each individual.

The Presidium of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet, in turn, announces that the highest organ of authority and government of the republic is taking energetic measures to stabilize the economy and the consumer market, to improve the economic situation, and to strengthen the sovereignty of Belorussia. At our suggestion the USSR Supreme Soviet included in the group of urgent questions for immediate consideration the state program for cleaning up after the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant.

Dear Comrades! In a couple of days you will elect new organs of power in the republic and in the local areas. They will have to actually participate in the further democratization of our life and in the resolution of numerous economic and social problems. We are strongly counting on having the voters of our republic make this choice in a well considered and serious way and cast their votes for those who stand for the people's interests not in words but in deeds.

So let us direct our energy, all of our forces and capabilities, and all of our actions into creative rather than destructive channels so as to create conditions worthy of the life of each individual, each family, and all the people of our republic.

Belorussian Runoff Elections Held

90UN1305A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 23 Mar 90 p 1

[Report by V. Roshchin on Belorussian runoff election (Minsk): "There is a Quorum, the Elections Continue"]

[Text] After last Saturday and Sunday the people of the republic were living in anticipation of the results of the runoffs in 194 districts for the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] people's deputy elections. Now they have been made known, but with the reservation from the Central Election Commission that they are preliminary. The elections have been held and recognized as valid in all districts. The polls were visited by seventy-seven percent of the voters. As a result of the voting another 181 candidates became Belorussian SSR people's deputies. Runoff elections will be held in the rest of the districts in May.

And so the next day the names of 279 deputies of the Belorussian parliament were known, which provides them with the necessary quorum for decisionmaking. What can be said about its composition in this stage? So far the largest group is comprised of economic functionaries and specialists, figures in science, culture, and education, and party and soviet workers. There are now considerably more medical workers and teachers in the Supreme Soviet.

The LKSMB [Belorussian Lenin Communist Youth League] has been able to win only two deputy mandates so far. Only three representatives of the fairer sex have become people's deputies, and it is quite a pity that the working class is represented by only a couple of people in the Belorussian parliament. Even now before the end of the elections one can predict that the number of rank-and- file workers in the current Supreme Soviet will be less than in the last one.

A couple of words about the nature of the pre-election battle. In almost all districts, especially in Minsk, it was heated and frequently improper. The devices frequently used by the competing sides (questionable collective letters, "guidelines" for voters of their own and other districts) were far from being what one could call befitting future parliamentarians.

Groups supporting the Belorussian People's Front and other informal associations, unlike the lower party organizations, were zealous in their promotion of their candidates. But the majority of the leaders did not succeed in winning the confidence of the voters. In Minsk there will be runoff elections in 19 districts. The intense election marathon is continuing.

Moldavian Chairman Discusses Sovereignty

PM1004155090 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 14, 8 Apr 90 p 5

[Interview with Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Chairman Mirchea Snegur by Aleksandr Petrov; date, place not given: "Mirchea Snegur: We're on Our Way to Consolidation"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] On April 17 Moldavia's new parliament will meet for the first session. We asked Mirchea Snegur, chairman of the Presidium of the Moldavian SSR's [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, people's deputies of the USSR and Moldavia, to comment on the sociopolitical situation in the republic.

M.S: Those were the most democratic elections ever held in our republic's history. The fact alone that there were five times more candidates than seats in parliament was encouraging: the republican parliament is composed of people who can debate the issues. And we badly need competent and meaningful parliamentary discussion.

The most important thing is that the discussion should be constructive for the benefit of the republic and all its citizens. I am not against tackling the most sensitive questions, nor am I afraid of emotional debates given that they are directed toward resolving problems, not making them worse. The new composition of the republican parliament, I believe, gives every reason to expect good results.

MN: The question of Moldavia's sovereignty will evidently be raised at the session. What sequence of discussing and solving this question would be most constructive?

M.S: It's imperative that we quickly draft and adopt at the Union level a wise law on the federation, clearly deliberating the functions of the Centre and the republics. This law will "fill the Soviet Federation with a new content."

I favour Moldavia's full-blooded sovereignty within a renewed Federation: every republic must choose for itself which rights should be delegated to the Centre, and which should be decided locally. We, for example, need to plan how much wine to produce and what kind of wine, at what price and to whom to sell it, whom to buy equipment and raw materials from. The Centre must not limit our relations with foreign partners or tell us out what enterprises should be built on the republic's territory.

In this I see the real prospects for Moldavia's sovereignty today.

MN: What is your attitude towards the possibility of discussing Moldavia's secession from the USSR at the session?

M.S: We must be realists and predicate ourselves on the republic's numerous ties with the USSR's economic complex. To raise the question of Moldavia's secession now would be untimely.

MN: How are Moldavia's relations with Romania today:

M.S: For many years massive propaganda campaigns were aimed at trying to prove "scientifically: that we are totally different peoples. Now this has been left behind: we openly say that we have a common culture, language and folklore. Now we are intensively developing the cultural and human contacts, which were artificially restricted in the past. With Moldavia returning to its Latin alphabet, we count on Romania's assistance in publishing. Soon we expect considerably to simplify the procedure for citizens of the Moldavian SSR to travel to Romania and to receive Romanian citizens in our Republic. A Moldavian government delegation will soon visit Bucharest, where we hope to expand on those agreements already reached.

A process of overcoming the deformations from past times is underway in this important sphere as well, and it is very important to do this reasonably: too much depends today on the consistence and pace of political decision-making.

MN: Will the new Moldavian parliament be able to reach consensus in this respect?

M.S: Moldavia's political development over the past few months gives every reason for optimism. I believe that we are on our way to consolidating all of the republic's healthy forces.

Moldavian Groups Hold Political Roundtable

LD1004222190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] A roundtable of public movements and organizations has begun work in the capital of Moldavia, sponsored by the Buro of the Central Committee of the republican Communist Party. For six days the leaders of 19 public political formations will discuss topical issues of the economic and political life of the republic.

Caucasus

Army General Views Caucasus Draft Problems

PM1104133590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Apr 90 First Edition p1

[Major A. Palyanichko report: "On the Eve of Conscription"]

[Text] The latest Armed Forces draft in the Transcaucasus is taking place against a background of constant outbreaks of interethnic discord, intensifying anti-Army feeling, and incidents connected with attempts by extremists to get possession of weapons and ammunition, including hooligan attacks on military guards. In such a crucial period it is particularly important to coordinate the efforts of military commissariats with republic, city, and rayon social organizations and party, soviet, and law enforcement bodies.

This, in particular, was the subject of a meeting between Army General P. Lushev, USSR first deputy defense minister, the heads of military departments in higher education establishments in the city of Yerevan, and representatives of military commissariats.

A range of problems connected with the spring draft were also discussed at a session of the Transcaucasus Military District Military Council. N. Chitanava, G. Gasanov, and V. Markaryants, chairmen of the Transcaucasian republics' Councils of Ministers, took part in its work.

Armenian 'Hooligans' Said To 'Harm' President

PM1104134790 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 11 Apr 90 p 1

["Own information" report under general heading: "Our Correspondents Report"]

[Text] **Yerevan**

A few days ago a USSR people's deputy proposed at a Supreme Soviet session that a law be adopted which would make provision for punishment for insulting the president. It seems that such a law should be adopted also at republic level.

A rally was held 9 April in front of the building of the Armenian Supreme Soviet.

Passions were running high and a group of hoolingans made use of this to burst into the Presidium building and, according to a report of the republic MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], caused considerable material damage to the building and inflicted bodily harm on the president of the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium.

On 10 April the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee noted that this could only have occurred in an atmosphere of disrespect for the law. The minister of internal affairs has been removed from his post.

Armenian Party Head on Rebuilding Republic

LD1104090290 Moscow TASS in English 0749 GMT 11 Apr 90

[Excerpts] Yerevan April 11 TASS—Follows news from Soviet Armenia:

Armenian Communist Party Leader—Interviewed

"We now face a fatal choice: Either national renaissance or further deepening of the economic crisis," newly-elected Armenian Communist Party Leader Vladimir Movsisyan told a party plenary meeting here.

"There is only one way out: To rebuild our home by joint efforts and to support the enhanced activity of people with a sober and well-considered national programme to provide them with a sovereign and worthy position within the renovating federation," he said.

Movisiyan noted that the republic will undergo serious social and economic transformations. "We should keep to the strengthening of republican sovereign rights and our economic independence."

"There is a need to convene an all-Armenian forum to elaborate a national programme for consolidation and revival," he stressed.

Movsisyan underlined the importance of the Nagorno-Karabakh problem, which is now in deadlock. "We will continue to defend the right of Artsakh Armenians to national self-determination. This problem must have a constitutional, civilised solution, with due respect for international human rights, which the Soviet Union is now seeking."

Armenian-Azerbaijani Railway Blockaded Again

Azerbaijani militants are again flouting the Soviet Government's instructions and blockading the Armenian-Azerbaijani railway.

"The traffic stopped ten days ago," deputy head of the Yerevan branch of the Transcaucasian Railway Albert Aroyan told TASS. "The only other route, connecting Armenia with other Union republics, is via Georgia. Unfortunately, this road carries less than 20 per cent of cargo sent to the republic." [passage omitted]

Nakhichevan, Armenian Leaders Discuss Situation

NC0904103590 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
0440 GMT 7 Apr 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The newspapers today published an AZERINFORM report on the situation in the Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] and Kazakhskiy Rayon. The report says that a meeting was held between the leaders of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] and the Nakhichevan ASSR in the town of (?Teberek) in (?Il'ichevskiy) Rayon to normalize the situation. The sides recommended that a state of emergency be imposed in the 42-km section of Azerbaijan railways which crosses Armenia's Megrinskiy Rayon and in the Armenian rayons bordering Azerbaijan.

Colonel General Shatalin, first deputy minister of internal affairs and head of the USSR Interior Ministry troops; Lieutenant General (?Ligorov), head of the Baku Department of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry [word indistinct]; and Major General [name and title indistinct], who also attended the meeting, approved the suggestion.

When will measures be taken to realize the [words indistinct]? This (?question) has caused the residents of the autonomous oblast unease.

Azerbaijan's Orudzhev Meets Rayon Workers

NC1104083190 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
0440 GMT 10 Apr 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] Regardless of the separatists and nationalists' efforts, life in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] is improving and the process of normalizing the situation is strengthening. Matters related to the question of strengthening the changes in the NKAO and quickening NKAO's social and economic development were the focus of attention in meetings between Tel'man Orudzhev, secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, and the workers of the Askeranskiy, Mardakertskiy, and Martuninskiy Rayons and Shusha City from 4 to 6 April. During the talks, the workers supported and defended the principled policy prusued by the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee to strengthen the republic's sovereignty, organize the steadfast forces, and normalize interethnic relations.

The people attending the meetings in Khodzhaly in Askeranskiy Rayon, (?Shushikend) in Mardakertskiy Rayon, and Karadagly and Khodzhavend in Martuninskiy Rayon and in Shusha City, talked about the work carried out by the republic's NKAO Organization Committee very sincerely. A number of proposals were made about the establishment of industrial branches in the towns, the broadening of the construction of apartments and other social installations, and the organization of trade.

Comrade Orudzhev gave detailed information to the participants of the meetings on additional measures by the CPSU Central Committee and the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee to resolve the social and economic problems in the region more quickly and improve the region's productive forces.

Rodayev, deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers Presidium and member of the NKAO Organization Committee, participated in the meetings.

Azerbaijan Council of Ministers Meeting Reported

NC1104082390 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
1730 GMT 9 Apr 90

[Excerpts] The meeting held by the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers Presidium examined the progress of the contruction of the installations, which will be used by the social insurance establishments and which have been included in the republic's complex program. Because of the absence of effective control by the construction organizations, the republic's social insurance ministry, and the local soviets, the program is making unsatisfactory progress. [passage omitted]

A serious discussion took place on childcare. The families and relatives must use every opportunity to bring up these children. [passage omitted]

The meeting also examined in detail the measures required to normalize the supply of money to the [word indistinct] market and strengthen the state's control on prices. Gasan Gasanov, chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers Presidium, summed up the meeting. He said that abandoning (?unproductive methods) and finding new ways to influence the consumer goods market is necessary. He also noted the need to reactivate the economy and realize all the proposals aimed at strengthening the links between the commodities and (?prices) and consolidating the mechanism used in fixing prices. Gasan Gasanov said that all the production and procuring resources have to be mobilized in order to provide goods to the people.

The presidium discussed the measures aimed at normalizing the work of the republic's industrial establishments, broadening the wholesale trade through various means in production, and organizing [words indistinct] for the people. It also examined a number of other social and economic matters.

Azerbaijan's Mutalibov Visits Lachinskiy Rayon

NC1104083990 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 10 Apr 90

[Text] The situation in our republic's rayons that border Armenia were further strained during the last 10 days of March. Armenian bandits and terrorists have raided the Azerbaijani towns close to the Armenian border. They have killed people and caused significant material damage. In view of this, the republic's leaders have been taking urgent measures with the cooperation of the party, soviet, and economic organs and the social organizations of the border rayons and the direct participation of the military command headquarters of the state of emergency regime in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] and the adjacent rayons.

On 10 April Comrade Ayaz Mutalibov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, visited Lachinskiy Rayon to become more familiar with the situation. Later he met with the workers. Khanlar Mamedov, first secretary of the Lachinskiy Rayon Party Committee, explained the situation of the border towns. Colonel General Shatalin, first deputy minister of internal affairs and head of the USSR Interior Ministry troops, addressed the participants. Comrade Mutalibov also addressed the representatives of the rayon residents and answered many questions.

Polyanichko, second secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee; Major General Sofonov, military commandant of the NKAO and the adjacent rayons; and Varennikov, deputy minister of internal affairs of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic, participated in the meeting.

Azerbaijan Party Official on Komsomol Conference

NC0904103090 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 7 Apr 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The Azerbaijan Leninist Communist Youth League [Komsomol] was represented by 67 boys and girls at the 21st All-Union Komsomol Congress. Ayaz Mutalibov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, received the republic's delegates to the 21st All-Union Komsomol Congress on 6 April. Mutalibov said: The All-Union Komsomol Congress will be held at a complex time in our society's development and in the restructuring of many of the mass and social organizations, including the Komsomol. It is the duty of each and every one of you to (?successfully) represent the republic's interests and cooperate to bring about a radical change in the [word indistinct] forms of work carried out with the youths, using the experience of your colleagues in the other regions. It is essential that the grave economic situation in the republic be rectified and preparations made to adopt the system of regional economy and self-management. We have vested significant hope in the large army of youths and in the industriousness and [word indistinct] of the youths in that regard.

The meeting also discussed the resolute measures put into effect by the leaders of Azerbaijan, the republic's organization committee, and party, soviet, and economic organs to stabilize the situation and restore normal life in and around the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

Comrades Afrand Dashdamirov, Ratib Zeynalov, Fuad Musayev, and Sahib Alekperov and Sabukhi Abidinov, chief of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Organizational Party Work and Cadre Affairs Department, participated in the meeting.

Tbilisi University Autonomy Changes Cited

90US0648A Tbilisi MOLODEZH GRUZII in Russian No 7, 16 Feb 90 pp 3, 10, 11

[Report on interview with Levan Aleksidze, prorector of Tbilisi State University, by N. Khalatyan: "'Autonomous' Means Self- Controlling"]

[Text] **Exactly a week ago, on the day commemorating David Agmashenebeli, in the 72d year of its existence Tbilisi State University declared the restoration of its autonomy. At an expanded university council meeting there was a sensation which...they waited, which had ripened in the university during the past 2 years.**

Moreover, a couple of days ago it was decided to create a commission that would take responsibility for all organizational questions. It includes instructors, students, and the best forces of the university.

Their work is still ahead of them, and therefore our discussion today is about the first steps toward an independent university. We spoke with the prorector of Tbilisi State University for training, Professor Levan Aleksidze.

[Khalatyan] In the first announcements about what happened in the university one could hear the word sovereignty. But in the declaration read at the expanded council meeting the subject was the restoration of autonomy. Is there an essential difference?

[Aleksidze] We have begun to use the word "sovereignty" frequently in the wrong place; it is a political term that means independence of state power. The university has restored the autonomy it had from the time it was established in 1918.

The desire for autonomy was inevitable, as perestroyka made the question of decentralization crucial. You know that at the Congress of People's Deputies they discussed the question of the expediency of the existence of the Ministry of Culture and the State Committee for Public Education. I, like many others, think that these structures have outlived their purpose and that questions of culture and education should be decided locally, in the republics.

Our desire for autonomy was brought about to a large degree by the fact that the independence of VUZ's [higher educational institutions], which was widely declared at all levels, remained that in words only. We still have a great deal of confusion with courses and programs; the Union Committee for Public Education has sent down instructions, as before, although they are now "truncated," with 50 percent of the subjects requiring attendance and the rest being discretionary. So what do we see happening, when the students are so overloaded. The smallest number of hours were left for their specialties, and this did not suit anyone. The students want to receive an education, a direction that has recently become more and more marked. They want to be specialists with high qualifications, and under the previous conditions the university could not give them this.

[Khalatyan] People are speaking more frequently now about the idea that it is time to make higher education for the elite. This idea can be heard clearly at the university as well. How do you feel about this?

[Aleksidze] I fully support this direction, in any case with respect to university education. It is time to get used to the idea that higher education cannot be universal. The problem is that in our country it has become easier to go to school than to work, say, at physical labor, and this contributes even more to the influx of young people into the VUZ's. We are losing a good deal of the work force for the same reason, and until there is fair pay for physical labor there will not be a normal balance in the distribution of resources. On top of this there is also the cult of higher education, which on the whole forms a social phenomenon in which I see a great danger for the nation. A possible solution is to arrange the system of correspondence education in such a way that it will receive an influx of youth. Let them work and study; nobody will stop them from doing that.

[Khalatyan] So far the university's autonomy has only been declared. On what principles will it be arranged?

[Aleksidze] Autonomy offers us the following rights: to change the structure of the university and its board ourselves, to hold elections and establish management organs, to develop and apply training plans and programs, to institute new specialities and get rid of unnecessary ones, to change the training process at our own discretion, to confer scholarly and pedagogical titles and degrees, to conduct an independent personnel, socioeconomic, external, and scientific policy, and many other things.

From now on the university will be subsidized directly from the republic budget (based on a special item in the state budget), state authorities will not intervene in our affairs, and our duty will be to train highly skilled specialists, scientific cadres, and state and social activists.

[Khalatyan] As far as I know we do not produce political scientists yet.

[Aleksidze] We do not yet have a special department, but for the second year now there has been a department of international law and political science in the law school, which trains specialists with a fairly broad profile—from international experts and managers to political scientists. Incidentally, we already have innovations in this department. We shall adhere to the European style in their training. I deliver several initial lectures and then I hand out the literature, and each student in the class will play the role of lecturer—we are setting up "brainstorming sessions" on certain subjects. There will be no evaluation at the end of the semester as there is now—everything will become clear during the course of the semester. In addition to the special subjects, three times a week there will be concentrated study of languages. On completing the VUZ students will have three required languages—Georgian, Russian, and one of the West European languages—English, French, or German.

[Khalatyan] How will students' rights be protected in an autonomous university?

[Aleksidze] The commission for developing the constitution of the Tbilisi State University must include students, and their rights will be stipulated in the constitution. There are many, and I shall name just a few: the right to attend lectures freely, to select a block of subjects at their own discretion, the possibility of preference for a particular instructor, and others. The rights of instructors will also be stipulated in the constitution and, of course, these sections will not contradict one another. The Constitution will be prepared openly by the best forces of the university, and its draft will be published in our newspaper and the republic press and then discussed. Before the end of this school year I think we shall have developed all the necessary normative and legal documents.

[Khalatyan] What structural changes will take place?

[Aleksidze] The rector of the independent university will be elected for 5 years and, apparently, for only one term. There will be a council, which will take responsibility for monitoring the activity of the rector's office. There is a suggestion to create another board of guardians that will include those who finance the university and participate in the distribution of funds.

There will apparently be a change in the system of elections and reports by the rector and prorectors to the board and the public—all this will also be reinforced constitutionally.

It seems very important to me that the departments be autonomous; they will have their own budgets and dispose of them independently. Everything will be decided at the level of the department—right down to the expulsion of students. For they will know each student better there, and ultimately I sign everything that is prepared in the department. Therefore the department council must also take responsibility for its students as it does all problems pertaining to the educational process or scholarly work.

[Khalatyan] So the department will resolve issues that sometimes cannot be resolved not only by the rector but even by the Ministry of Public Education and many higher organs. I have in mind the long, drawn-out proceedings for expelling a failing student, which sometimes continue for months.

[Aleksidze] I hope so. If the department has the last word the petitioner will have nowhere to turn. Of course the dean must show courage and consistency here. But there is nowhere to turn. But unless we have strict requirements we will never raise the level of education. Only the person who can learn should study at the university, and we should not turn it into an alms house.

[Khalatyan] There exists the opinion that we are not yet ready for the university's autonomy, that we are being too hasty. But this step was dictated by attitudes that are in opposition to the current administration, which made it necessary to hurry this decision. Is this so?

[Aleksidze] We began speaking about the university's autonomy two years ago (a similar movement began, as we know, in Moscow State University, Leningrad State University, and other VUZ's) and therefore, in my view, it is wrong to think that we acted out of response to any attitudes. To be honest, we planned to declare autonomy in about a month, but then decided to coordinate it with the day of the founding of our university, and I think this was justified.

As concerns opposition, of course opposing moods and opinions exert an influence on the actions of the rectors in places where we consider that the proposals are constructive.

On the other hand, recent events in the university have shown many that people are trying to settle personal accounts and satisfy ambitions on the wave of the national movement. In the final analysis these events have even played a certain consolidating role. In any case, the rectors have never had this much support before, and this gives us power.

[Khalatyan] The university must be absolutely free of ideological pressure. But the party committee and the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] committee still exist at Tbilisi State University. How will you resolve this problem?

[Aleksidze] Not by force, of course. Let everyone decide for himself which party or movement to support. Since we are taking the path of pluralism, I think that all groups and parties that receive official status may have their own cells in the university. Let there be 100 parties—in an autonomous university nobody will interfere with their activity (within the limits of the law, of course). Let the students decide for themselves which movement to support, for actually this is what they are doing even if they are informal, but they all have their own coordinating centers.

Let them decide for themselves about the Komsomol as well. And if not a single Komsomol member remains in the university—that is the students' affair. The greatest mistake is the existence of the Komsomol central committee, gorkoms [city committees] and raykoms [rayon committees] that have been transformed into bureaucratic apparatuses. Of course honest people have also worked in the Komsomol, but no ideological considerations can justify what they have turned others into.

There should be no monopoly of the Komsomol or the party.

As a jurist I have occasion to consult with representatives of many informal organizations. And I see that were it not for this radicalism (without taking things too far, of course) there would be no democratism or liberalism in Georgia. They shake us up and make us look at many things differently. I believe that the time will come when there will be a consolidation of forces, but it is impossible to exist without opposition, and this is true in any society. In England, for example, the opposition leader receives his wages from the Queen's treasury—that is a fact.

[Khalatyan] Since we have already brought up the subject of finances, many people will probably be interested in who will have to pay in the autonomous university. It seems that we have already come to accept the notion that it is necessary to pay for higher education.

[Aleksidze] Not paying for education has devalued it; this has long been known. But we have encountered such difficulties that today we cannot change the entire university all at once over to the system that is generally accepted in the West. We will introduce it partially, in the neutral departments first, for instance the department for West European studies, which will change over to economic accountability, and in several others.

It is understandable that we will immediately encounter cases of social injustice, for it would be no big deal for some fat cat to pay a lot of money so his offspring can have a diploma without working for it. It is necessary to develop a regulating mechanism which would, for instance, release capable, talented students from payment. Some people's education could be paid for by an enterprise or philanthropic fund, and so forth. I repeat—all these variants will be discussed.

[Khalatyan] What will be the approximate fee for a course?

[Aleksidze] So far it is difficult to say. But it is understandable, for example, that the 3,000 it costs the state to produce a graduate is a very small amount.

[Khalatyan] How will an autonomous university regulate its relations with planning organizations? After all, your graduates will still be labor resources.

[Aleksidze] The state will pay us for training strong personnel, we shall distribute them, and the rest will be arranged however possible. This right will finally be given to the university, for up until now we have known only how many students we can accept. But what do we do with them tomorrow? If we planned to send out 100 people, they actually sent us orders for 15. The rest of them did not receive jobs, and the university banged its head against the wall. We must reach the point where we are not the ones who go begging, but rather people seek out our personnel. Apparently that is the way it will be. All organizations will change over to economic accountability; jurists, economists, and intelligent specialists are needed everywhere, and no one will take up the leftovers.

[Khalatyan] One of the advantages of autonomy is that you can enter into direct relations with foreign higher educational institutions. Reciprocal exchanges of students and teachers have begun. What are the prospects?

[Aleksidze] Most tempting. We have something to offer. Our foreign partners are interested, in the first place, in our Georgian culture, language, history, and in the achievements of our physicists, biologists, and philologists. We need to raise the general level, but we do have priorities in psychology, applied mathematics, nuclear physics, high-energy physics, and a number of other sciences. We have arranged contacts with the leading countries such as the United States, England, the FRG, France, China, and Japan; we have recently established relations with Israel; we are interested in cooperating with Turkey; and we have long been sending our students to the socialist countries. We must create a good complex for accepting foreign students and teachers—this is a problem for now.